

(3)
3

A
VINDICATION
OF THE
ANSWER
TO SOME
Late Papers
Concerning the
UNITY and AUTHORITY
OF THE
Catholick Church.
AND THE
REFORMATION
OF THE
CHURCH of ENGLAND.

L O N D O N,

Printed for Richard Chiswell, at the *Rose and Crown*
in *S. Paul's Church-Yard.* MDCLXXXVII.

VINDICATION

OF THE

W. S. W. R.

TO SOME

Large Papers

Concerning the

UNITED STATES

OF THE

Caribbean Islands

AND THE

REFORMATION

OF THE

OF THE

A VINDICATION of the ANSWER to Some late PAPERS, &c.

IT was so tempting a piece of Honour, to appear *as the Champion of the Royal Papers*, that I rather wonder that no more, than that these, have shewed themselves to the World, under so inviting a *Character*. Which seems to have betray'd them into more than usual security; presuming, I suppose, that they are to be looked on, as a sort of *Heralds in Controversie*, whose bearing the *Royal Arms*, will keep them from being touched themselves, though they bid defiance to others. But where Truth lies at stake, every one hath a Right to put in for it; and whose Game soever any Person plays, those ought to carry it who have the best Cards to shew: I mean, that in Debates of this Nature and Consequence, other considerations ought to be so far laid aside, that the strongest Reason should prevail. But lest I be again thought *to have a mind to flourish before I offer to pass*; Def. p. 1. Pag. 2. as the *Champion* speaks in his proper Language; I shall apply my self to the Matter before us. Only taking notice that I am now glad to enter the Lists upon even Ground. For although I thought I behaved my self with due Respect and Decency before, yet I perceive the Measure of those things is so nice and arbitrary, that it is very hard to escape Censures, where the Distance is so great. But those who live in the Country may mean and intend as well to their Prince, as those who live at Court, though they do not make so fine Legs, nor are of so pleasing an Address.

The plain truth is; Controversie is quite another thing from Courtship and Poetry. It is like a Trial at Law, which ought to depend on Evidence and Proof, though the King himself be concerned in it. And as we must give Honour to whom Honour, so Truth to whom Truth is due: and this without Respect of Persons; it being a Case long since decided, That *Truth is greater than the King*.

A Vindication of the Answer

If I thought there were no such thing in the World as true Religion, and that *the Priests of all Religions are alike*, I might have been as nimble a Convert, and as early a Defender of the Royal Papers, as any one of these Champions. For why should not one who believes no Religion, declare for any? But since I do verily believe not only that there is such a thing as true Religion, but that it is only to be found in the Books of Holy Scripture, I have Reason to enquire after the best means of understanding the sense of those Books, and thereby, if it may be, to put an end to the Controversies of Christendom.

This was the noble design of the two Royal Papers; which are written with far greater strength, and spirit, and closeness, than these which are published in Defence of them. But notwithstanding all their fair appearance, I could not be convinced by the Reason contained in them, (and much less by the Defence of them) Which I endeavour'd to represent as far as I could judge, with Modesty and Civility. But if I have offended in any thing against the strict Rules of good Manners, I hope I may be the more easily forgiven, since their Casuists allow involuntary faults to be in their own nature venial.

The Method propos'd by the Paper for ending Controversies, was by finding out a Principle for doing it, *as visible as that the Scripture is in Print*. This I could not but extremely approve, as a very satisfactory method of proceeding; and the Consequence I said would be, that all Men of sense would soon give over disputing; for none who dare to believe what they see, can call that in Question.

Page. m.

The Author of the Reply saith, *I mistook the meaning of the words*, which he saith was this, *That what ever Motives render it visible that a Book in Print is Scripture*, i. e. the Word of God, the same or other Motives are as powerful to render this other truth as visible, that none can be that Church, but that which is called the Roman-Catholick Church.

Def. p. 2, 3.

The Defender saith, *The Church is more visible than Scripture, because the Scripture is seen by the Church; for which he brings S. Augustin's Authority*. And if by saying that the Scripture is in Print, be understood a thing out of Question; then he denies it to be visible that the Scripture is in Print; because many Men do call Scripture in question at this day, and to question whether the Book in print be Scripture, is manifestly to question whether Scripture be in print.

The Words of the Royal Paper are plain, but these Interpretations of them so forced and unnatural, that there needs no other confutation of them, but to compare their confused Comment with the Text. *It is as visible, as that the Scripture is in Print*; that is, it is a thing evident to sense; for so it is that *the Book called the Scripture or the Bible is in Print*. Now what is it which is affirmed in the Paper to be thus evident? *viz. this Proposition, That none can be that one Church which Christ has here on Earth, but that which is called the Roman Catholick Church.* But if it be certain (as I doubt not to make it appear) that what is called the Roman-Catholick Church, is but a Part of that *One Church which Christ has here on Earth*, then the plain result of this Proposition must be, that it is a thing evident to sense that *a Part is the Whole*. Now this looked so oddly, that these Gentlemen were resolved that this should not be the sense of the plain words; and therefore have endeavoured to put another sense, (if it may be called so) upon them. And if their Church can but interpret Scripture at this rate, we are in a hopeful way to have a speedy and happy end of Controversies.

As to the Consequence I drew from hence, that if Controversies could be determined by a Principle as visible as that Scripture is in Print, all Men of sense would soon give over disputing, for none who dare believe what they see would call that in question; One saith, *The sooner the better*. So say I too, upon good grounds. But what would then become of *the Noble Science of Controversie*? The other saith, *That Catholicks and Protestants are both Men of sense, and yet they dispute about the Scripture which is in Print.* And what then? This is to shew that *the Scriptures being in Print* is one thing, and the Authority of the Scripture is another. The one is a common object of sense in which all are agreed; the other is liable to many Disputes, and therefore could not be meant in the Papers.

But they have a notable Cavil against Mens believing what they see, because *Faith is of things not seen*. This Cavil had been as good against our Blessed Saviour, when he said to Thomas, *because thou hast seen, thou hast believed*. I hope upon second thoughts, they will not tell him, that this was improperly spoken, and not like a Schoolman. Call it what you will, the single Question is, Whether your Church will allow us to Judge of things according to the plain Evidence of Sense? One saith, *It is impossible that any Man should be commanded not to believe what he sees.* Believing here

Def. p. 2.

Rep. p. 2.

Def. p. 3.

Rep. p. 3.

Rep. p. 3.

here is the *Judgment* of the Mind upon the Representation of Sense; and will he secure us that the Church can never require us to judge otherwise than according to the Evidence of Sense? I wish he would make his words good, for I assure him he would remove a terrible block out of our way. My Senses plainly tell me, what I see and feel and taste is as much Bread after Consecration as it was before; how then comes it to pass that my Judgment that it was Bread before, was very good; but although there be the very same Evidence afterwards, without the least alteration to Sense, yet then I am to judge just contrary, *i. e.* that it is not Bread, which I see and feel and taste just as I did before?

But he saith, *what is seen is only the form, shape and figure of Bread and Wine, and that they believe to be there.* But alas! This doth not reach to the point. For the Question is not about external appearances, but about the Judgment of the Mind upon the Evidence of Sense. I will make this matter plainer, that they may know where the Difficulty lies. When Christ's Body appeared to the Disciples after his Resurrection, there was no dispute among them concerning *the form, shape and figure of his body*, but the doubt was, whether from these they were to conclude that it was Christ's real Body or not? If not, they could not believe from the Evidence of Sense that Christ's Body was risen from the dead; if they were, let them tell us how Christ's Body comes to be so much changed and to lose those essential properties of a body which it once had and was judged by; and farther, what ground there is for us now not to allow that Judgment of Sense which Christ himself appealed to, after the Institution of the Sacrament? For if Christ had therein declared that our Senses are not to be our Rule of judging concerning his Body; he would certainly not have appealed so soon after to the Senses of his Disciples concerning that very Body; and neither he nor his Disciples have given the least intimation, that what we see and feel to be one body, we must believe to be quite another which we can neither see nor feel.

Did not two Angels appear to Lot in the figure and shapes of Men; and the Holy Ghost descend in the form of a Dove? And were they who saw them, to believe according to the Evidence of Sense? I answer, that there is a great deal of difference to be made between Invisible Powers appearing under bodily shapes, and a natural, visible, palpable extended body losing the Properties of a body and

and becoming invifible, impalpable and indivifible; And withal there is a great difference, between Spiritual Powers uniting the real particles of Matter into a Body, and the making the Form, Figure, and Shape of a real Body to be where there is no Subftance of a body. We do not pretend to judge by our Senfes of Invisibile Subftances under outward appearances; but of the Truth of a bodily Subftance by all the Appearances of a body, under all the Circumftances neceffary for the right judgment of Senfe.

The other faith, *he knows of no Church which allows not People to believe all they fee.* May we then believe that to be ftill Bread which we fee to be fo? No, he faith, *the What of a thing is not the Object of Senfe.* I perceive then our Senfes are very impertinent things; and only give an account of the Circumftances and not of the Subftances of things. But I pray did not the Difciples perceive the *What* of Chrifft's Body by their Senfes? How do we know the *What* of any bodily Subftance but by them? It is meer Collufion to fay *our Senfes do not judge of Subftances*; for our bare Senfes judge of nothing, but are the means of conveying the impreffions or Reprerentations inward, whereby our Minds do pafs Judgment upon things. And either we cannot know the Subftance of any thing fenfible, or we muft know the *What* of it (as he fpeaks,) by our Senfes.

Def. p. 3, 4.

We now come to the main bufinefs; which for the clearer proceeding I fhall put under three diftinct Heads.

- I. Concerning the Unity of the Catholick Church.
- II. Concerning the Authority of it.
- III. Concerning the Reformation of the Church of England.

I. Of the Unity of the Catholick Church:

AND here the point to be discussed, is, *viz.* *Whether that which is called the Roman-Catholick Church, be that one Church which Christ has here on Earth?*

(1.) The first thing I objected against it was, that a Part cannot be the Whole; but that which is called the Roman-Catholick Church is but a Part; and therefore it cannot be the One Catholick Church of Christ here on earth.

Here, to prevent cavilling, I must declare that I meant not the *Roman Diocese* or *Province*, but *all the Churches which live in Communion with and Subjection to the Bishop of Rome as Head of the Church; and look on it as necessary to Salvation so to do.* And this I still assert to be but a Part of the Catholick Church and a corrupt one too.

Reg. 5a.

The Author of the *Defence* saith, *all this Riddle of Part and Whole comes from my Inadvertence.* How so? *Because I confound the Roman Diocese with the Roman-Catholick Church.* No, I assure him I did take it in their own sense, for all that embrace the matters of Faith which are received in the *Roman Communion.* And He need not fear my doing otherwise; for I intend to discourse of no other Church but this; and this I deny, as so taken, to be the *One Catholick Church.* *Doth not Catholic signifie all the Parts?* I am sure it ought to do so; but I say it doth not, when *Roman* is joyned to *Catholick*; for then it excludes all those from being Parts of the *Catholic Church*, which do not joyn in the *Roman Communion*; and this I say is unreasonable. And here I expected some Proof in so material a Point; but there is not a Word farther, than that *Catholic comprehends all*; but I say again, *Roman Catholic* excludes all that are not in its Communion. As suppose any one should say *the German Ocean is the whole Sea*; and to prove it, should reason as this Gentleman doth; *Ocean is the whole Sea, is it not? And is it the less*
the

the Ocean, because German is added to it? No; the Ocean is just as large as ever it was; but the adding *German* to it restrains the sense of *Ocean* to it within certain bounds; and excludes many parts of the great Ocean, which are without those limits. Just so it is in adding *Roman* to *Catholic*; *Catholic* alone comprehends all the Parts of the Church, but *Roman* added to it confines the Sense of it to those who embrace the Faith received in the *Roman Communion*; and this excludes all other Parts of the *Catholic Church*: and so makes a Part to be the Whole.

(2.) I objected farther, that if this had been the Catholic Church meant in the Creeds, this limitation ought to have been expressed in the Creeds, and put to Persons to be baptized; which being never done in the Roman Church it self, I thence infer'd that it did not believe it self to be the one Catholic Church, which we profess to believe in the Creeds.

Here the Author of the Reply answers, that *Catholic* and *Roman-Catholic* were in the Language of Antiquity one and the same thing; and this point being never called in Question in the time when the Creeds were published, there was no occasion to put *Roman* into the Creeds; no more than of putting in *Consubstantial* with the Father till it was denied.

This were a substantial way of answering the Difficulty, if it would in any measure hold. But I shall now prove just the Contrary to have been the Sense of Authority by plain and undeniable Instances in matters of fact, in most of the Ages of the Christian Church, from the very next to the Apostolical, down to the Council of Trent. To which I shall only premise this, which I think no *Roman Catholic* will deny me, viz. that the *Roman Catholic Church* doth imply Obedience to the Bishop of Rome as Supreme visible Head of the Church under Christ. For Bellarmine and others, make not only Faith and Sacraments necessary to the Being of the Church, but submission to lawful Pastors, and especially to the Pope as Christ's only Vicar upon Earth; and he placeth the Essential Unity of the Catholic Church in the Conjunction of the members, under Christ and his Vicar, as Head of the Church. And from hence he excludes Schismatics out of the Catholic Church, though they have Unity of Faith and Sacraments.

Catech. Rom.
Part. 1. c. 10.
n. 10.

ments and Hope and Spirit. And the Roman Catechism makes Union with the Pope as visible Head of the Church necessary to the Unity of the Catholic Church.

And the Proofs I bring shall not be from short or doubtful sentences, but from remarkable passages and notorious Acts of the Church.

In the First Age of the Church the name *Catholic* was as little known, as the *Authority* of the *Roman Church*; it not being once found in the Apostolical Writings; for the Inscriptions of the *Catholic Epistles* are of latter times. And if they were allowed to be Apostolical, they would be far from proving any thing to this purpose, since the *Roman Church* is never mentioned in these Epistles, unless under the name of *Babylon*; and I suppose they would not like the Title of the *Catholic Babylonish Church*. But in all the directions of the Apostles concerning Unity of Faith, there is not one which gives the least intimation, that the *Roman Church* in any sense was to be the Rule or Standard of Faith or Communion.

In the Second Age we find two remarkable Instances that the Communion of the *Catholic Church* was not to be taken from Conjunction with the Bishop of Rome as Head of it.

The first is from the Bishop of Rome's approving the Prophecies of *Montanus*, *Prisca* and *Maximilla*. This would hardly appear credible, if *Tertullian* had not expressly affirmed it; and he farther saith that had it not been for *Praxeas* a Heretick, he had taken them into the Communion of the *Catholic Church*; and he prevailed with him to revoke his communicatory Letters already past. What a Case had the *Catholic Church* been in at this time, if the Bishop of Rome had been look'd on as the Centre of *Catholic Communion*, and if he had not been better informed by *Praxeas* a Heretick?

The second in the same Age is when *Victor* took upon him to excommunicate the Eastern Bishops for not celebrating *Easter* at the same time they did at Rome. If now the Eastern Bishops did own the *Roman-Catholic* and *Catholic Church* to be the same, they must shew it at such a time by their regard to the Pope's sentence as Head of the *Catholic Church*: but they owned no such Authority he had over them; and instead of it *Polycrates* Bishop of *Ephesus*, with a Council of Bishops joyning with him about A. D. 197 wrote a sinart Epistle to *Victor*, wherein they let him know they would go on in their

Not a Collat.
Concil. Balw.
p. 10.

way,

way, notwithstanding his threats, and that it was better to obey God than Man. From whence it is observable, That they followed their own judgment against the Pope's; and that they believed the Pope required things of them to contrary to the Will of God, that they resolved to disobey him. And his requiring their compliance was no Argument of his *Authersty*, but of his *Usurpation*.

In the Third Age happen'd a famous contest between Stephen Bishop of Rome, and the Eastern and African Bishops, about Re-baptizing Hereticks. I meddle not now with the Controversie it self, but with the Sense of those Bishops upon occasion of it as to the Roman-Catholic Church. The Bishop of Rome did at least threaten to Excommunicate the African Bishops. And if Firmilian may be believed, he did actually Excommunicate the Asian Bishops. How did these Primitive Bishops behave themselves under this Sentence? They charge Stephen with Insolence, *V. Epist. Cy-Folly, Contempt of his Brethren, and breaking the Peace of the Catholic Church; and cutting himself off from the Unity of it.* The words are, *abscindere se à Charitatis unitate, & alienum se per omnia fratribus facere.* Now I desire to know, whether these Bishops believed the necessary conjunction of Roman and Catholic together? And whether Bishop of Rome were thought to be the Centre of Communion in the Catholic Church? It is plain, they made him the Cause of the Schism; and thought themselves never the less in the Catholic Church for being out of the Roman Communion.

In the Fourth Age the Government and Subordination of the Catholic Church was established in the Council of Nice according to ancient Custom; but we read not a word of the Roman Catholic Church there; or any Priviledge or Authority the Bishop of Rome had, but within his own Province, and such as the Bishops of Antioch and Alexandria had in theirs. And when the Bishop of Rome in that Age interposed to restore some Bishops cast out of Communion by the Eastern Bishops, they declared against it as a violation of the Rules of the Catholic Church; and this became the Occasion of the first Breach between the Eastern and Western Churches. In the same Age Liberius, Bishop of Rome, joyned with the Eastern Bishops in casting Athanasius out of the Catholic Church, and subscribed the Arian Confession of Faith; as both Hilary and S. Jerome witness; and it appears from his Seventh Epistle, and the old Lesson in the Roman Bre-

A Vindication of the Answer

Breviary, 19 Kal. Sept. which hath been since expunged for telling Tales

In the Fifth Age happened a greater breach between the Bishops of *Rome* and the *Eastern Churches*. For *Acacius* the Bishop of *Constantinople*, not complying with what the Bishops of *Rome* desired from him, was solemnly excommunicated by *Felix III.* But notwithstanding this, the Emperour and Eastern Bishops continued still in his Communion; and they complained that the proceedings against him were against the Rules of the Church, and favoured of great Pride, as appears by the Epistles of *Gelasius*, who succeeded *Felix*. And upon this a notorious Schism happened, which the Eastern Churches charged the Church of *Rome* with; and believed themselves to be still in the Communion of the *Catholic Church*.

In the Sixth Age *Vigilius* Bishop of *Rome* gives an undeniable evidence of the difference between *Communion* with the *Catholic Church* and with the *Bishop of Rome*. When he went to *Constantinople*, upon *Justinian's* Summons, about the three Chapters, not only the Church of *Rome*, but that of *Africa, Sardinia, Istria, Illyricum* and others, earnestly entreated him not to consent to the condemning them; accordingly when he came to *Constantinople* he was so warm and zealous in the Cause, that he forthwith excommunicates the Patriarch and his adherents; among whom the Empress her self was one: But soon after he was so much mollified, that he not only took off his Sentence, but privately agreed with the Emperour to condemn the *Three Chapters*. Which was discovered to the Western Churches by *Rusticus* and *Sebastianus*, who were then with him: Whereupon they cried out upon him for prevaricating and betraying the Council of *Chalcedon*; and the *African Bishops* not only condemned his Judgment, but excommunicated him and all that consented to it; and so did the Bishops of *Illyricum*. Which Schism continued many years, as appears by the Epistles of *Pelagius II.* and *Gregory*. *Vigilius* finding how the matter was resented in the Western Churches, yields to a General Council; which the Emperour Summon'd at *Constantinople*; in the mean time he publishes an *Edict* against the *Three Chapters*. *Vigilius* to recover his Credit with the Western Bishops, denounces Excommunication against those that yielded to it; but the *Greeks* despised his *Censure*, and immediately went to celebrate Divine Offices. When the Council sate he refused to come; which they regarded

Epist. 4. 8.

*Facund. L. 4.
c. 3.*

*Victor. Tunn.
Post Coll.
Basil X.*

regarded not, but went on and condemned the *Three Chapters* without him; but when the Council was ended he complied with it; as now appears from the *Authentic Acts* lately published. *Nova Collect. Concil. p. 1551.*

Let any Man now judge, whether *Communion* with the Bishop of *Rome* were then looked on as a necessary condition of being in the *Catholic Church*, either by the Eastern or Western Churches.

In the Seventh Age there is a necessity to make a Distinction between the *Communion* with the Bishop of *Rome*, and with the *Catholic Church*; because *Honorius* then Bishop of *Rome* is condemned by the Sixth General Council, for contradicting the *Apostolical Doctrine*, and the *Definitions of Councils*, and for following the false *Doctrines of Hereticks*. And the same Judgment is confirmed by the Seventh and Eighth Councils, which are received for General in the Church of *Rome*. And *Leo I.* in his Epistle to the Emperour, wherein he confirms the Sixth Council, expressly Anathematizes his Predecessor *Honorius* for no less than betraying the *Catholic Faith*. And in the Profession of Faith made by every new Bishop of *Rome* (extant in the *Diary*) *Honorius* is Anathematized by name. Was it then the *Roman Catholic Church* which joyned in *Communion* with *Honorius*?

In the Eighth Age the Bishop of *Rome* approved the Second Council of *Nice*; but notwithstanding the Western Churches stiffly opposed it, as contrary to Faith; which they could not have done, if at that time the Pope had been looked on as the Head and Center of *Catholic Communion*.

In the Ninth Age happened the great breach between the two Patriarchs of *Rome* and *Constantinople*, which in consequence engaged the Eastern and Western Churches against each other. And although the restoring of *Photius* after the death of *Ignatius* seemed to put an end to it; yet the difference increased chiefly upon two points, that of *Jurisdiction* and the *Addition to the Creed*, made by the Western Church, which the Council under *Photius* did Anathematize; and the whole *Greek Church*, with the Four Patriarchs, joyned in it; as arguing Imperfection in the Creed and the Tradition of their Fore-fathers. And upon these two Points this *Schism* began; although *Photius* did charge the *Latin Church* with other things; which made *Nicolaus I.* to employ the best Pens they had to defend the *Latins* against the *Greeks*. One of which

was

Ratramus. c.
Græc. apud
Daker. Spicil.
 To. 2. p. 3.
 24, 27, 29, 53,
 54, 55, 51, 52.

was *Ratramus* lately published; who lived at that time; and it is observable in him, That he supposes both to be still *Parts of the Catholic Church*; and he often distinguishes the *Latin Church* or the *whole Roman Communion*, from the *Catholic Church*; which he saith, was extended from the *East to the West, from the North to the South*.

In the Eleventh Age this *Schism* brake forth with greater violence, in the time of *Leo IX.* and *Michael Cerularius* Patriarch of *Constantinople*. To the former occasions of difference, a new one was added, never mention'd in *Photius* his time, viz. the use of unleavened Bread in the Sacrament, by the *Latin Church*. Of this, with other things, *Michael Cerularius* complained; the Pope sends Three *Nuntio's* to *Constantinople*, who behaved themselves rudely and insolently towards the Patriarch; as he shews in his Epistles to the Patriarch of *Antioch*, published lately by *Cotelerius*; there he declares he would not treat with them about Religion without the other Patriarchs; upon which they pronounced them obstinate, and proceeded to Excommunicate the whole *Greek Church* for not complying with them. And the Patriarch returned the kindness and Anathematized them. The Form of the *Anathema* against the *Greeks* is printed with *Humbertus*; and the short of it is, *whoever contradicts the Roman See is to be excluded Catholic Communion, and be made Anathema Maranatha*.

This was plain dealing; but it was the Eleventh Age before things came to this height. And yet in that very *Anathema* one of the Reasons assigned, was because the *Greeks* like the *Donatists* confined the *Catholic Church* to themselves.

In the Thirteenth Age *Innocent III.* writes to the *Greek Emperor* to bring the *Greeks* back to the Unity of the Church; the Patriarch of *Constantinople* writes back again to know what he meant by it, and how he could call the *Roman Church*, the *One Catholic Church*, since *Christians* made but one Flock under their several Pastors, Christ himself being Head over all. The Pope answers, The Church is called *Catholic* two ways. 1. As it consists of all particular Churches, and so he grants the *Roman Church* is not the *Catholic Church*, but a part of it, though the chief. 2. As it holds under it all particular Churches; and so, he saith, The *Roman Church* only is the *Catholic Church*. And so he makes owning the *Roman Church* to be Mother and Mistress of all Churches, as he there saith, to be a necessary condition of *Catholic Communion*.

Monumenta
Græc. To. 2.
 p. 138. n. 6.
 p. 164. n. 3,
 4, 5.

Canis. Antiq.
Leit. To. 6.
 p. 197.

pag. 196.

Innocent. III.
Ep. l. 1. 353.

Lib. 2. 208.

Ep. 209.

munion. And thus it becomes the *Roman Catholic Church*. But this was a very new notion of the *Catholic Church*, which in the Fathers of the Church was taken in one of these two Senses.

1. *With Respect to Faith*; and so *Catholic* was the same with *Sound* and of a *right Faith*, in opposition to the notorious *Heresies* of the First Ages. So it was used by *Ignatius*, against the *Heresies* of that time, which denied *Jesus* to be *Christ*; therefore, saith he, *Wherever Christ Jesus is, there is the Catholic Church*. After him *Polycarp* is called by the Church of *Smyrna*, *Bishop of the Catholic Church in Smyrna*. So the Council of *Antioch* speaking of the deposition of *Paulus Samosatenus* say, *They must set another Bishop over the Catholic Church there*. *Clement Alexandrinus* saith, *The Catholic Church is ancienter than Heresies; that it hath the Unity of the Faith, and subsists only in the Truth*. *Pacianus* observes, *That in those Ages the Hereticks went by other Names, but the sound Christians were known by the Name of Catholics, which had been of very ancient use in the Church, though not found in Scripture*; as *Fulgentius* likewise observes. But *Lactantius* takes notice that the *Hereticks* had gotten the trick of using that *Name*; and then his Rule is to discern the *true Catholic Church* by the *true Religion*. For he not only saith before, *That the Catholic Church is to be known by the true Worship of God*; but when he comes to lay down the Notes of the *true Church*, the first of them is *Religion*. So I find in an old *Lactantius*, printed at *Rome*, *A. D. 1470*. but, for what Reason I know not, it is left out in the latter Editions. In the Conference between the *Donatists* and the *Catholic Bishops*, both sides challenged the name of *Catholics* to themselves; and the *Roman Judge* determined, *It should belong to them who were found to have Truth on their side*. Pope *Innocent III.* in a Council at *Rome* declares, *That all the Churches in the World are called one from the Unity of the Catholic Faith*. And in the Canon before, he mentions the *Roman Church* as distinct from the *Catholic*, but comprehended under it while it adheres to the *Catholic Faith*. Which was not then understood to be what the *Roman Church* declares to be so; but what was universally received in the Church from the *Apostles* times, and was delivered

Ignat. ad Smyrn. p. 6.

Euseb. l. 4. c. 14. L. 7. c. 24.

Strom. l. 7. p. 764, 765, 755. Pacian. Ep. 1.

Fulgent. Op. p. 63. Lactant. In?it. i. 4. c. ult. Sola igitur Catholica est que verum Cultum retinet.

Basile. Concil. p. 286.

Supplem. Concil. Gall. p. 14. Can. 6.

livered in the Creeds to the Persons to be admitted by Baptism into the Catholic Church.

2. With respect to Persons and Places. And so Catholic was first taken in opposition to the Jewish Confinement of Salvation to themselves; and of Gods appointed Worship to one Temple. So Ignatius saith, *The Church is one Body, made up of Jews and Gentiles.* And the Church of Smyrna writes to all the Members of the Catholic Church in all places: and the Council of Antioch writes to the whole Catholic Church under Heaven. S. Cyril saith, *The Church is called Catholic from its Universal spreading and teaching the whole Doctrine of Christ to all sorts of Persons.* Athanasius saith, *It is called Catholic, because it is dispersed over the World.* Theophylact saith, *The Catholic Church is a Body made up of all Churches, whereof Christ is the Head.* And the African Bishops from the first beginning of the Dispute with the Donatists laid great weight upon this, That the Catholic Church was to be taken in its largest Extent; or else the Promises could not be fulfilled; as may be seen in Optatus, who saith, *The Church is called Catholic, not only from its having the true Faith, but from its being every where dispersed.* And S. Augustine hath written whole Books to prove it. In the Conference with the Donatists, the Catholic Bishops, and especially S. Augustin, plead, that they are called Catholic be-

cause they hold communion with the whole World of Christians; and not with these only of a particular Title or Denomination. For therein they made the Schism of the Donatists consist; not barely in a causeless Separation; but in confining the Catholic Church to themselves, who at best were but a Part of it. And because the notion which Innocent III. gives, is liable to the same charge, it cannot be excused from the same guilt.

Thus we have found the Author of this Notion of the Roman Catholic Church, viz. for such as own the Supremacy of the Church of Rome, as he explains it more fully in the same Epistle.

Epist. ad
Smyrna.

Ensch. l. 4.
c. 14. l. 7.
c. 74.

Cyrill. Catech.
18. p. 220.

Athanas. To. 2.
p. 402.

Theophyl. in 1
Cor. 12. 27.

Opt. c. Par.
l. 2. Cum in-
de dicta sit
Catholica, quod
sit rationalis
& ubique dis-
fusa.

Baluz. Coll. Concil. p. 287, 288.

Nos universo orbi Christiano communione co-
heremus. n. 100.

Et appellantur & merito sunt Catholici ip-
sa sua communione nomen testantes. Catholici
enim secundum totam dicuntur. Qui autem a
toto separatus est, partemque deseruit ab uni-
verso præcisam, non sibi usurpet hoc nomen, sed
nobiscum teneat veritatem. n. 101.

But yet this Notion of the *Catholic Church* was not Universally received after *Innocent III.* For in the Fifteenth Age, in the Council of *Florence*, Cardinal *Bessarion* disputing with the *Greeks* about the Authority of the *Roman Church*, in making an Addition to the Creed, saith, *That how great so ever the Power of the Roman Church be, he grants it is less than that of a General Council, or the Catholic Church.* From whence it follows, that the Notion of the *Catholic Church* cannot be taken from owning the *Roman Church* to be *Mistress of all Churches*; for then the *Catholic Church* is bound to submit to the Decrees of the *Roman Church* about Matters of Faith.

In the beginning of the same Age the Council of *Constance* met, and in the Fourth Session declared, *That a General council represents the Catholic Church, and hath its Power immediately from Christ; and that in matters of Faith, Unity of the Church, and Reformation, all Persons, even Popes themselves are bound to submit to it.* And truly it was but necessary for them to take off from the Popes Authority in matters of Faith, since they charge *Joh. XXIII.* with no less than frequent and pertinacious denying the *Immortality of the Soul.* Was not this Man fit to be an *Infallible Head of the Catholic Church*, and the true Center of *Christian Communion*? *Bellarmin* saith, *this Article was not proved, but only commonly believed, because of the dissoluteness of his Life.* But this is but a poor defence; since this Article stands upon Record against him in all the Editions of the Council of *Constance*; which I have compared; even that at *Rome*, said to be collated with Manuscripts. And why should so scandalous an Article be suffered to stand, unless there were such a consent of Copies that it could not for shame be removed?

*Council Constant. Sess. 11.
Concil. Gen.
To. 12. p. 87.
De Rom. Pont.
l. 4. c. 14.*

The Doctrine of the Council of *Constance* was confirmed by the Council of *Basil*, and is to this day maintained by the Clergy of *France*, as appears by their Declaration made *A. D. 1682.* From whence it follows, that the Church is not called *Catholic* from relation to the *Roman Church*; but to the whole Body of *Christians*: and that the *Unity* of it, is not to be taken from the respect it bears to an external *Visible Head* which may fail, but to *Christ as the essential Head of the Church.* This is the express Doctrine of the *Cardinal de Alliaco, Joh. Major,*

Almain, Gerson and many others; and follows from the Decree of the Council of Constance.

Def. p. 23.

Thus I have briefly deduced the Sense of the Christian Church in this matter from the Apostolical times; and that not meerly from the sayings of particular Men; but from publick, solemn, and undoubted Acts of the Church. Which I have the rather done, because the *Defender* saith, *we have no Antiquity on our side in this Cause, but as much as since Luther.* I think I have produced a little more, and too much for him to Answer.

It is time now to consider what proof the Replier brings, that *Catholic and Roman-Catholic in the Sense of Antiquity were one and the same thing.*

Pag. 6.

He produces the Testimonies of *Tertullian* and *Cyprian*, *wherein the Church of Rome is called the Catholic Church.* Who doubts that in those days there was a *Catholic Church* at *Rome*? For every particular Church which agreed in the *Catholic Faith* was then called the *Catholic Church* of such a place. And innumerable Instances of this kind may be gathered out of Antiquity; both as to the City of *Rome*, and other Cities as well as that; and surely they were not all *Catholic Churches* in his Sense; when he agrees there is but *One Catholic Church*; nay more, even *Parochial Churches* were called *Catholic*, as he may find in *Cotelerius*.

Not. in Mon.
non. Grec. To.
2. p. 601.

S. Ambrose's Testimony signifies no more, than that *Satyrus* coming into a Place suspected for the *Luciferian Schism*, asked if the *Bishop* joyned with the *Catholic Bishops*, i. e. with the *Roman Church*. Which is no more than whether he agreed with his own Church; for *Satyrus* was a *Roman* born. But this would prove any other Church to be the *One Catholic Church* altogether as well as the *Roman*.

The Patriarch of *Constantinople* writes to *Hormisdas*, that he would not hereafter recite in the *Diptychs* the Names of those who were excommunicated by the *Apostolical See*. And what follows? But he saith, *They were sever'd from the Communion of the Catholic Church.* And so were those excommunicated by the Patriarch of *Constantinople*. But the words are, *who do not in all things consent with the See Apostolic*; but the plain meaning is, of those who were cast out of Communion, for the words are too, *Sequestrates a Communione Ecclesie Catholicae.* And doth this

this prove the *Roman Church* to have any more relation to the *Catholic*, than the Church of the meanest Bishop in the *Catholic Church*?

As to the calling of *Catholics Romanists* by the Gothic *Arians*; that relates to the *Roman Empire*, and not to the *Roman Church*.

And now let any impartial Reader judge whether the sense of *Antiquity* be not admirably cleared by these passages, as to the making out *Roman* and *Catholic* to be the same. But to proceed.

(3.) I said farther, that if the *Roman Church* believed it self to be the *Catholick Church*, it must void the Baptism of those who are out of its Communion; but since Baptism doth enter persons into the *Catholic Church*, by its own Confession, the *Catholic Church* which is owned in the Creeds, must be of larger Extent than the *Roman*.

In Answer to this, they both tell me *this point hath been over-ruled long ago by the Catholic Church; the Baptism of Hereticks being allowed to be good.* But since it is granted, that Baptism doth enter Persons into that *Catholic Church we believe in the Creeds*, doth it not evidently follow, that the *Catholic Church in the Creeds* is larger than the *Roman Communion*? For it takes in those which the other doth not. Doth not the *Catholic Church* take in all that are admitted into the *Catholick Church*? but many more by their own Confession are admitted into it than are of the *Roman Communion*, and therefore it unavoidably follows, that the *Roman Catholick Church* cannot be the *Catholic Church* believed in the two Creeds.

And although according to *S. Augustine*, the validity of Baptism depends on the right form of words and not the good Disposition of him that administers; yet Baptism where it is valid must have its due Effect, which is entering Persons into the *Catholic Church*.

But say they, *Doth not Heresie, &c. cast them out of the Catholic Church?* Suppose it doth, yet if Heresie do cast them out, they were in the Church till they were cast out of it. Their being allowed to be in it doth my business; let them prove them cast out by Heresie when they please.

But

Reply p. 8.
Defence p. 7.

Pag. 8.

But the Defender saith, *I suppose what I should prove, and then prove it by means of that supposition.*

Here I am to seek; for do I not prove from their own *Supposition* and not from mine, that Baptism doth enter persons into the Catholic Church? and therefore from thence I prove, that themselves cannot believe the *Catholic and Roman Church* to be all one; since they allow many multitudes to be entred into the *Catholic Church*, which they deny to be of the *Roman Church*.

Pag. 9.

Yet he goes on, that *such persons are not truly Members either of the Catholic or Roman-Catholic Church.* No? then Baptism doth not admit Persons into the *Catholic Church*. Which is very new Doctrine, and fit only for new Converts, and is directly contrary to the *Roman Catechism*, which saith, *Baptism is the Gate by which we enter into the Church.* They were so far Members, saith he, as Baptism could make them. And that I hope was to make them Members of Christs Body; or else what becomes of the Council of Trent, which so expressly asserts, and that with an *Anathema*, the *Validity and Efficacy of the Sacraments in general*? and of *Baptism in particular*? And there is a special *Anathema* against those who say that *Children baptized are not to be reckon'd inter fideles*, and I hope those are Members of the *Catholic Church*. Is there Remission of sins, Communion with the Holy Spirit granted out of the *Catholic Church*? yet these are the *Effects of Baptism*, owned by all Persons in the Church of Rome; or else they cannot themselves be of the *Roman Communion*.

Catech. Rom.
Part 1. c. 10.
n. 20.

Sess. 7.
Can. 7, 8, 9.

De Bapt.
Can. 13.

What is it then I pray to be as much Members of the Church as Baptism could make them? What can make them more Members than Baptism doth? According to their own Doctrine. But they are as far off the *Roman Church* as they are off the *Catholic*. Say you so? then no more is requisite to make a Man a Member of the *Roman Church*, than is necessary to his Baptism. This is great News, and would be very welcome to the Christian World. I have heard of many Projects of Accommodation; but none seem to be like this. For then no more is necessary to make us Members of the *Roman Church* than of the *Catholic*, i. e. owning the Creed and our Baptismal Vow. Nay, hold there, saith he,

Pag. 10.

he, the Profession of the Catholic Faith is necessary to make one a true Member of the Roman-Catholic Church. This is the meaning of a whole Page, or else it has none: Suppose this to be true; and it proves what I intend. For either this Catholic Faith is the same which was required to Baptism, or not. If the same, then no more is required than owning the Creeds, to make a Member of the Roman-Catholic Church; if not the same, then those who are Members of the Catholic Church by Baptism, are not Members of the Roman-Catholic till a farther Profession of the Roman Faith; and consequently the Catholic Church and the Roman-Catholic are not the same, since those may be Members of the Catholic Church, who are not of the Roman-Catholic. Can any thing be plainer? Pag. 7.

And the Replier is so much a Gentleman, to own the Truth of it. For these are his words, that Baptism enters persons into the Catholic Church, who though they be out of the Communion of the Roman Church, yet having the true form of Baptism are Members of the Catholic Church. Therefore the Catholick Church and Roman-Catholic cannot be the same. Which was all I intended to prove. Reply p. 8.

But he saith, that as Baptism enters them into the Catholic Church, so Heresie, Apostasie, or Infidelity casts them out; or else the old Hereticks, which he reckons up, were still Members of the Catholic Church. I answer, that my Argument was not concerning the old Hereticks, who rejected any Article of the Creed, which was delivered at Baptism, and the owning of it required in order to it; but concerning the Roman-Catholic Church, which makes the owning New Articles of Faith necessary in order to its Communion; and if this Church reject any from its Communion who do own the Articles of the Creeds, it follows from thence, that it is not the Catholic Church into which Persons are admitted by Baptism.

But no Man if an Heretick, though baptized, can remain in the Church. If he be convicted of renouncing the Creed, upon the owning whereof he was received to Baptism, he casts himself out of the Church; for he doth not stand to his Promise. If you mean that any thing which the Roman-Catholic Church declares to be Heresie, casts a Man out of the Pag. 9.
the

A Vindication of the Answer

the *Catholic Church*, I do utterly deny it, and I see no Reason brought to prove it.

(4.) I argued, that in a divided State of the Church there may be different Communions, and yet both may remain Parts of the *Catholic Church*; for which I instanced in the Excommunications of old about keeping *Easter*, and the Differences between the Eastern and Western Churches; but to appropriate the title of the One Catholic Church to any one of the divided Parties, so as to exclude the rest, was to charge that Party with the *Schism*, as in the case of the *Novatians* and *Donatists*; and consequently, to apply the *One Catholic Church* to the *Roman*, was to make it guilty of the present *Schism* in the Christian World.

Both the Defender and Replier behave themselves in their Answers to this, as if they did not understand what I aimed at; and therefore run out into things by the bye, as if they thought there were no difference between saying something to a Book, and giving an Answer to it. What I can pick up, which seems material, I will set down distinctly.

Page 9, 10.

The Replier takes notice that I said, *that before the Unhappy Divisions of the Christian Church it had been no difficulty to have shewed that one visible Church which Christ had here upon Earth*; to which he answers, *that there were Divisions in the Apostles times, and the same Means which were then used to preserve the Unity of the Catholic Church, did equally serve for after Ages and continue to this day, and so the Unity of the Catholic Church is still as visible as ever it was*. This in few words I take to be the force of what he saith. But certainly there was a time when the Unity of the *Catholic Church* was a little more discernable than now it is. Doth not the Scripture tell us, *the Multitude was of one heart and one Soul*? Are all Christians so at this day? I grant afterward there were *Schisms* and *Heresies* in the Apostolical Churches. But the Apostles had an Infallible Spirit, which they manifested by the Power of Miracles going along with it, by which means the *Heresies* were laid open and the *Schisms* stopped. But what were those *Heresies*? Such as contradicted the *Articles of the Creed*, as about the *Truth of Christ's Incarnation*, and the *Resurrection of the Dead* &c. and therefore the Apostles by the Assistance of

of that Infallible Spirit did write Epistles to the Churches, to declare that which was to be the standing Faith of all Ages; and by an unquestionable Tradition (in the Church of *Rome*) they sum'd up these Fundamental Points of Faith in that which is therefore called *the Apostles Creed*. This was therefore the Standard whereby to judge of *Faith* and *Heresie*; and by this, they proceeded in the Ages succeeding the Apostles. Afterwards, some did not bare faced contradict the Articles of the Creed, but broached such Doctrines as did by consequence overthrow them; as the *Arians* by making a *Creature God*, the *Nestorians* and *Eutychians* denying in effect the Truth of *Christ's Incarnation*; against these the *General Councils* assembled and the Eastern and Western Churches joyned in condemning them; not from their own Authority as Supreme or Infallible Judges; but as the most Authentic Witnesses of the true Apostolical Doctrine. And thus the Creed was enlarged by general Consent through the whole Catholic Church, and that which was called the *Nicene Creed* was made the standard of *Catholic Communion*.

But to prevent any Mischief by overcharging the Creed, the General Council of *Ephesus* did absolutely forbid any farther additions to be made to it, and the Council of *Chalcedon* ratified that prohibition. All that they pretended to, was only to give the true Sense of the Articles therein received about the Incarnation of *Christ*, and the same was declared by the fifth and sixth General Councils; whereof the one was to clear the Council of *Chalcedon* from favouring *Nestorianism*, and the other to shew that the *Humane Nature* in *Christ* was perfect, as to the Affections of the Soul as well as the Body.

*Concil Ephes.
Part 2. Act. 6.
Chalcedon.
Act. 5.*

But after this, a mighty Breach happen'd between the Eastern and Western Churches; and setting aside the different Customs in both (which might easily have been composed) there were two things, which made this breach irreconcilable.

1. The Western Churches taking upon them to make a New Addition to the Creed; as to *the Spirit's proceeding from the Son*; without asking the Consent of the Eastern Churches.

2. The Bishop of *Rome's* assuming to himself an Authority of Headship over the Catholic Church. They did not deny him a Primacy of Order, as he had the first Patriarchal See; but when he

D

took

took upon him to exercise Jurisdiction in the other Patriarchates as well as his own, and sent Legates for that purpose, they rejected his Authority, and so the Breach continued.

Def. p. 14.

But the Defender saith, *the Popes Supremacy, if his Memory fail him not, was not so much as made a pretence till near 200 years after the Schism began, nor any where more acknowledged than in Greece, nor by any body more than by him that began the Schism.* If his Memory fail him not, I am sure, something else doth. For nothing can be more notorious from the very Epistles of the *Popes* on Occasion of this Schism, than that this was at the bottom of all; whatever pretences might be made use of sometimes to palliate the matter. Let him but read the Epistles of *Leo I.* to *Anatolius* and concerning him; the Epistles of *Gregory I.* about the title of Oecumenical Patriarch; the Epistles of *Nicolaus I.* concerning *Photius*; of *Leo IX.* concerning *Michael Cernularius*, and I think he will be of another Opinion; and that the Controversie about Supremacy, to the Scandal of the Christian World, was the true occasion of that dreadful Schism. But all the Eastern Churches I said however different among themselves to this day, look on the Pope's Supremacy as an Innovation to the Church.

Eag. p. 15.

To which the Replier saith, *the Eastern Churches were divided from the Roman Catholic Church by such Doctrines as are inconsistent with the Church of England which professes to hold with the four first General Councils.*

I will not deny but the breach as to the *Nestorians* began on the account of the Council of *Ephesus*; but whether the Christians under the *Turk* and *Persians* in *Asia* are truly *Nestorians* is another Question: I think not, for this Reason. In the beginning of this Century, the Patriarch of those Christians called his most learned Men about him to consider what their Doctrine really was, and how far they differ'd from the Roman Church about Christ; since the Missionaries from thence, still charged them with Heresie: and they declared the difference to be only in Words and the manner of explication. For however they say that every Nature hath a Person inseparable from it (by which they mean no more than a Subsistence) yet from the Union of these two in Christ, they hold that there is but one *Persona* they call it, or *One Son* resulting from the Union of both Natures. And as long as they hold a real Union of both Natures.

Natures and one Filiation. (as they speak) resulting from it, it is beyond my understanding that they should be guilty of the Nestorian Heresie. And this account was given to Paul 5. by one sent from their Patriarch, and ordered to be Printed by him at Rome. But is it not really a very hard Case for 300000 Families, who as is there said were under that Patriarch, to be excluded the Catholic Church, and consequently from Salvation, for not right understanding the Subtilties of the distinction between Nature and Person; as, whether Subsistence can be separated from Individual Nature; or whether an Hypostatical Union doth imply that the Individual Nature doth lose its own Subsistence? I appeal to the Conscience of any good Christian, whether he thinks Christ and his Apostles did ever make the knowledge of these things necessary to Salvation; which the subtillest of their Schoolmen are never able to explain to the capacities of the far greatest part of Mankind.

Pet. Stroza,
de Dogmat.
Chalde in
Proleg. c. 3.
Rom. 16:17.

The like may be said, as to those called Eutychians, I do not doubt but the Confusion of both Natures in Christ was a Doctrine justly condemned by the Council of Chalcedon, because he could not be true Man, if the Nature of Man were lost in him; but I think there is no Reason to condemn those for that Heresie, who declare they reject the Doctrine of Eutyches, and that they hold two Natures in Christ making up one Personated Nature without mixture or Confusion, as their Patriarch explained their Doctrine to Leonardus Abel Bishop of Sidon, when Gregory 13. sent his Nuncio into those parts, on purpose to understand their Doctrines. And the latter Missionaries confirm the same thing; that they do not deny two Natures in Christ, but say that two Natures are as parts making up by their Union one Nature with a Person. And herein they say, Dioscorus, whom they follow, differ'd from Eutyches. And must such infinite Numbers of this perswasion in the Eastern and Western parts be excluded from the Catholic Church for not knowing the difference between a Person resulting from the Union of two Natures; and one Nature without a Person arising from two Natures without mixture or Confusion? A late Writer of the Roman Communion is so ingenuous to acknowledge that the Heresies charged on the Eastern Churches are imaginary and that they differ only in terms, from that which is owned to be the Catholic Faith.

Apud Thom. à
Jesu. l. 7. c. 14.

Philipp. à
SS. Trinit.
Itiner. Orient.
l. 5. c. 5.
Saccin. Hist.
Societ. Jesu.
l. 6. 12. 123.

Voyage du
Mont Liban du
Daudini Ro-
marques sur
Chap. 26. p.
383.

Disput. de Ori-
gine, Nomine &
Religione Ma-
ronitarum.

And *Faustus Naironius* hath lately published a Book at *Rome* to prove that the *Maronites* have been all along good Catholics; although the Popes in their Bulls from the time of *Innocent III.* have still charged them with Heresie.

As to the *Greeks*, there is yet less Reason to charge them with *Heresie*; since they adhere to the Four General Councils; and out of Zeal for the Decree of the Council of *Ephesus*, will not allow the Addition which the Western Church made to the Creed.

So that upon the whole matter, there is nothing to exclude the Eastern Churches from being *Parts of the Catholic Church*, but denying the Popes Supremacy.

Pag. 15.

But he tells us, *some of these* (if his Authors deceive him not) as the *Egyptians and Ethiopians* have often made Overtures to the Pope for Peace and Communion, owning him for Supreme Head of the Church, provided only they might not be obliged to renounce *Eutyches and Dioscorus*. I am extremely afraid his Authors have deceived him, I wish he had named them that others might beware of them. I suppose he means that which *Baronius* printed at the end of his sixth Tome, of a solemn Embassy from the Patriarch of *Alexandria* and all the Provinces of *Egypt* to own the Pope as Supreme Head of the Church; which was soon after found to be a meer cheat and imposture. How far the *Ethiopians* are from owning the Popes Authority he may find in *Ludolphus*, or *Balthasar Tellez*. It is true the Pope sent a Patriarch into the East upon a Division among themselves; but after a while, he was forced to withdraw to the remotest parts of *Persia*, and to leave their own Patriarch in full Power. The Bishop of *Sidon* relates, what ill success he had with the Patriarch of the *Jacobites*. And it is well known how soon the *Greeks* returned to their old Opposition after the Council of *Florence*. I had therefore Reason to say, that all the Churches of the East however different among themselves agreed in rejecting the Pope's Supremacy, and to this day look on it as an Innovation in the Church.

Pag. 16.

As to what he afterwards speaks of their *Blasphemies against the Divinity and Humanity of Christ*, I now leave the World to judge of them; and if they be true, all Men must condemn the Popes *Missionaries* for notorious Liers; for the Judgment I make of them, is from the Relations they have given us. And if these be true, I can by no means allow them to be excluded from

from being *Parts* of the *Catholic Church*; and so that must be of far greater extent than the *Roman-Catholic Church*. But to go on.

I observed that which I thought a material difference in the Schisms of the Church, some I said were consistent with both Parties remaining in the *Catholic Church*; for which I instanced in the Bishops of *Rome* Excommunicating the Bishops of *Asia*, about *Easter*; and those of *Asia* and *Africa* about *Re-baptizing*. Others were for excluding all out of the Church but themselves, as the *Novatians* and *Donatists*.

The *Replier* tells me he doth not think this difference at all material. For what Reason? Because the Church is the last Tribunal in all differences; and whosoever separates from her is to be reputed as a *Heathen* or a *Publican*. It seems then the Bishops of *Asia* for not keeping *Easter* with Pope *Victor*, were as very *Heathens* and *Publicans* as the *Novatians* and *Donatists*. I hope this Gentleman after all, will not make the Church so severe in all its Censures, to cut Men presently off from being Members of the *Catholic Church*. I had learnt from *S. Augustin*, That Excommunications are sometimes used by way of Discipline to bring Persons to a sense of their Faults, and not to cut them off from the People of God. But suppose Excommunications should always cut Persons off from the *Catholic Church*, is it not to be supposed that they are just and reasonable? Suppose the matter doth not deserve it, or there be false suggestions, or a precipitate sentence; is it really all one, if the Church happens to Excommunicate? But beside all this, suppose one Bishop in the Church takes upon him to Excommunicate others for little or no cause, and against the advice of his Brethren; which was the Case of *Victor* about the *Asian* Bishops; must they be cut off from the *Catholic Church* as effectually, as if they had been guilty of the greatest *Hereſie* or *Schiſm*? Pag. 11.
A. c. Donat.
p. 6. Collat.
c. 20.

But not to affix too severe a censure on the *Replier*, in the next Page he doth acknowledge a material difference; which he saith was, That the whole Church was not yet engaged, and till a Decision be made by the whole Church, the Parts may Excommunicate each other, and remain Parts of the Church still. Now this, in my Opinion, makes very much for me. For in this divided state of the Christian World, the whole Church is not engaged as to any Decision of the present differences; and therefore no Parts can be cut off by Pag. 12, 13.

*Prejugés legit.
contre le Jan-
senism. p. 135.*

by other Parts from the *Catholic Church*. For, since the breaches of Christendom, there hath been no Representative of the *Catholic Church*; and is not like to be; and so the divided Parts remain Parts of the *Catholic Church* still. The Council of *Trent* was so far from it, that the famous Abbot of *S. Cyprian* called it a *Cabal of Schoolmen* influenced by the Pope. And there is a great deal of difference between the Decision of Schoolmen and of the *Catholic Church*.

I cannot but still think it material to observe, that in Schisms of the most dangerous nature, the fault was laid on that Part which appropriated the Title of the *Catholic Church* to it self; as in the *Novatians* and *Donatists*.

Page. 14.

Here the *Defender* puts in his Exceptions; for he saith, *It sounds, as if I would have that Title never rightly applied, but to those who do not challenge it; in likelihood because they have no pretence to it.* The insinuation is, as if I were willing any should be called the *Catholic Church*; but that which is. But in earnest, I am as much against any one Part being called the *Whole*, as another. And from the Case of the *Novatians* and *Donatists* I have learnt to charge the Schism on those, who at best being but a Part challenge the *Whole* to themselves. But he cannot understand how it comes to be *Presumption*, and a cause of Schism in one part of a *Division* to assume it. I am very sorry for it, that he cannot understand it to be a presumption in a Part, to call it self the *Whole*. He saith, *In a Division, it is not well intelligible how more than one Part can bear it.* I say it is not at all intelligible how any Part can bear it. What thinks he of the *Novatians* and *Donatists*? Was it not *Presumption* in them to arrogate the Title of the *Catholic Church* to themselves? And were they not therefore guilty of the Schism?

In the ancient Church there were two sorts of Schisms, which I think it material to observe.

1. A Factious Schism.
2. A Sacrilegious Schism.

(1.) A Factious Schism; when Men out of opposition to their lawful Governours, in the Church set up separate Assemblies. Which by the Fathers are called *ἑτερονομασία*, as by *S. Basil* in his Epistle to *Amphilochius*, where he distinguisheth *Heresie*, Schism and unlawful Meetings. *Heresie* is against some necessary point of Faith; Schism is a Separation from the *Catholic Church* about

about matters of Discipline; And unlawful Assemblies are such as are set up against the Rules of the Church. Those who were guilty of these were received upon due submission; those who were guilty of Schism were to renounce their Schism; and those who were guilty of Heresy, were to be re-baptized. This was S. Basil's Judgment, and is followed by Balsamon, Zonaras and Aristinus. And S. Basil himself saith, *This was the Sense of the Fathers before him.*

(2.) A *Sacrilegious Schism* is that which robs the Church of God of that which belongs to it, i. e. which excludes all but their own Number from being true Members of the Church. And this was the Schism charged on the Novatians and Donatists. This S. Augustine very often charges upon the latter, as a very high piece of Schism; for, saith he, while they confine the Church to their own Communion, they are guilty of manifest Sacrilege, both against Christ and his Church.

C. Parmen. l. 1.
c. ult. l. 2. c. 11.
11.
C. Crescon. l. 4.
c. 10, 11.

And whosoever follow their steps, and exclude any Parts of the Church from being so, and confine the Church to their own Communion, they are guilty of the same *Sacrilegious Schism*; which is of a higher nature than a meer Factionous Schism. But the Defender saith, *The Language of the World has always preserved the Title of Catholic to one Part, and given the name of Sect or Part cut off to the other.*

Page 14.

By the *Language of the World*, he must mean of that Part which excludes the rest. Which he calls *the World* by the very same Figure by which a Part challenges to be the Whole. But in consequence to this, for all that I can yet see, these who were excluded out of the Catholic Church, must be taken in by Baptism. And S. Cyprian, Firmilian, and S. Basil saw this well enough. I confess it was after carried, That Hereticks were to be distinguished, and those only to be Re-baptized who renounced the Baptismal Faith, in Father, Son and Holy Ghost. And the meaning, I suppose was, that nothing but that exclude Persons out of the Catholic Church; and those Hereticks whose Baptism was allow'd, were of an inferiour sort; and by not disowning their Baptism, they shew'd they looked on them only as corrupted Parts of the Church. And so did the Councils of Nice and Arles; which did not utterly reject Re-baptization, but only of those who preserved the Baptismal Faith. It was not therefore the Sense of the Ancient Church, that upon every dissension in matters of Faith from the

Concil. Nic.
c. 19.
Aril. c. 8.

the general Doctrine of the Church, one Party must be excluded from the *Catholic Church*, and that Title belong to the other.

But he proceeds, *That this Presumption cannot be the Cause of Schisms, which must happen before the Presumption.*

This is very easily answered. For a breach there must be before; but the *Schism* belongs to those who were the *true Causes* of the Breach. If therefore any one Part assumes to it self the right of the whole, and requires the owning it from all that joyn in Communion with it, this very act makes it justifiable (not to separate from the *Catholic Church*) but not to joyn in Communion with that Part on such unreasonable terms.

Pag. 11.

Well, saith he, *Suppose the dividing Parts do still continue Parts of the Catholic Whole; cannot the Roman-Catholic be that Whole, i. e. Suppose there be many Parts, why may not one of them be the Whole? For still, the Roman-Catholic is but a Part, though Catholic be the Whole; as though the Ocean be the whole, yet the British, or Gallican, or Spanish, or Atlantick Ocean, is but a Part of the Whole Ocean.* I am ashamed to pursue so clear a point any farther.

Pag. 12.

But he hath one fetch behind still, viz. *That it is one Faith which makes the Catholic Church one; if therefore the Roman Catholic Church be a Part of this Catholic Whole, the other Parts must believe as she does, or else they cannot be Parts.*

I will endeavour to make this clear to him, and so end this Dispute.

The Church is a Society of Persons who own and profess the Christian Faith; Therefore Faith is necessary to the very being of a Church; for unless they believe the *Christian Doctrine*, they cannot be the Christian Church. This Faith which is necessary to make them Christians, is to be embraced by all who are Members of this Church; their entrance is by *Baptism*; the Faith is the Creed delivered to those who are to be Baptized; which being universally received by Christians, that makes the common Bond of Union in the Parts of this great Body; and this is the *One Faith of the Catholic Church*.

But if he thinks the *Roman-Catholic Church* can make all its Decisions a Part of this *one Faith*, he is extremely mistaken. As will more fully appear in the following Discourse.

II. Of the Authority of the Catholic Church.

THE whole and sole design of the First Paper, as the Replier tells me, was to evince this Point. That all Controversial Points of Faith, either about Holy Scripture, or other Subjects, do fall under the Judgment and Decision of the Church. But, under Favour, that is not the whole Design of it; for this implies no more than that the Church may, if it pleases, decide them; but the Design is, to prove, That in all Matters of Faith the Churches Authority is without farther Examination to be submitted to; so that all that Christians have to do is but to enquire into Two things. 1. Where the Church is. 2. Whether the Church hath declared its Judgment or not.

And several things are objected in the Papers against the not submitting to the Churches Judgment, viz. That every one will be his own Judge; which is not allowed in common matters, much less in matters of Faith; that no such Authority is given to every particular Man by Scripture; but the Churches Authority is there established; and was owned in the Primitive Church in the Creeds, and about the Canonical Books; and since the Church had once such a Power, there is no reason to suppose it lost; but upon differences happening, the Churches Judgment is to be submitted to.

This is the whole strength and force of the First Paper; and it is about a Subject of the highest Importance, both as to the satisfaction of particular Persons, and the Peace of the Christian World. And the clearing these Two Points will go a very great way towards the putting an end to

Controversies. 1. That in all Disputes we are to search no farther, but presently to yield to the Judgment of the Church. 2. That the *Roman Catholic Church* is that Church. How far I am from being satisfied with the latter doth already appear; I now set my self to consider the other.

And here are these things necessary to be debated,

1. Whether Christ and his Apostles did establish such a standing Judicature in the Church, to which all Christians were bound to submit in matters of Faith?
2. Whether the Primitive Church did own such a Judicature; And did accordingly govern their Faith?
3. Whether it be an unreasonable thing to suppose the contrary, viz. That Christ should leave Men to judge for themselves in matters which concern their Salvation, according to the Scriptures?

(1.) Whether Christ and his Apostles did establish such a standing Judicature in the Church to put an end to all Controversies which should arise about matters of Faith? We do not Question but Christ might have done it if he had pleased; and there is no doubt he foresaw all those Inconveniences which are now objected against the want of it; But the point before us, is, Whether Christ, who alone could do it, hath declared this to be his Will and Pleasure? We are then to consider, that this being a Point of so great Consequence, the Commission for such a Court of Judicature in the Church ought to be delivered in the plainest and clearest Words that may be; for otherwise this were to beget Controversies instead of putting an end to them. When God under the Law, established a Supreme Court of Appeal as to the differences which might arise about the Law, he tells them where that Court should sit, and commands the People to go up thither and hear their Sentence and submit to it. This was a plain and clear
decla-

declaration of the Will of God; and they had no more to do but to go up to the Place which God did chuse, viz. *Jerusalem*. And there was never any dispute afterwards among the *Israelites* what they were to do when Differences happened; for an Appeal lay to the Court of *Jerusalem*, and the Sentence of that Court they were to stand to on pain of Death. Our blessed Saviour knew this Constitution among the *Jews*, when he founded his Church; and if he had intended any such thing therein, he would not have fallen short of the exactness of the Law in the things necessary in order to the Establishment of it; i. e. he would not have failed to have told us, who were to make up that Supreme Court, and where it was to Sit. For these things were necessary to the end of it. Shall we then say that Christ was not yet resolved where it should be? Or, that it was not fit to let it be known so soon? But why not, when he made Promises to the Apostles of *being with them to the end of the World*? There can be no pretence, why he should not then declare, where the Supreme and standing Court of his Church was to be; which was in all Ages to give Rules to the rest of the Church, and to Determine all Points of Faith which came before them.

But did the Apostles Determine this matter after Christ's Ascension? If they had done it, we must have yielded, because they had an Infallible Spirit: But we find nothing like it in all their Writings. They mention *Heresies* often, and *damnable* ones they saw *creeping into the Church*, they lamented the Schisms and Divisions in the Churches of their own Planting, and used frequent and vehement Exhortations to Peace and Unity. But why not a word of the Infallible Judge of Controversies all this while? S. Paul wrote to the Church of *Rome* it self, and even there mentions *Dissensions that were among them*, as well as Rom. 16.17. in any other Church. What, could not he tell them they were to make Rules and give Judgment for the whole Church? Did S. Paul envy this Privilege to S. Peter's See, and therefore took no notice of it? That I suppose will not be said of him, though he once *withstood him to the face*. But, how happen the rest of the Apostles

not to do it? Nay, how came *S. Peter* himself, writing for the benefit of the whole Church, in a *Catholic Epistle*, never to give the least intimation concerning it? These things make it appear incredible to me, that *Christ* or his *Apostles* appointed any such thing; especially, when the *Apostles* in their infallible Writings give such Directions to particular Christians as they do; to prove all things, and to hold fast that which is good; to try the Spirits whether they be of God or not. What had they to do to try the Spirits, or to prove any thing themselves, if the Judgment of the matters of Faith were so given to the Church, that others without farther enquiry are bound to submit to its Sentence? And if *Christ* and his *Apostles* knew nothing of such an Infallible Judge; we have no Reason to hearken to any, who after their time should pretend to it. For the Promise of Infallibility must be made by him; and such a Commission can be derived only from the immediate Authority of *Christ* himself.

But the *Defender* saith, *The Holy Scripture assures us that the Church is the Foundation and Pillar of Truth*. I confess, I cannot be assured from hence, that the Church hath such an Authority as is here pleaded for, suppose it be understood of the whole Church. For how was it possible the Church at that time should be the *Foundation and Pillar of Truth*, when the *Apostles* had the Infallible Spirit, and were to guide and direct the whole Church? It seems therefore far more probable to me, that those words relate to *Timothy*, and not to the Church, by a very common *Elleipsis*, viz. how he ought to behave himself in the Church of God, which is the House of the living God, as a Pillar and Support of Truth: and to that purpose this whole Epistle was written to him; as appears by the beginning of it, wherein he is charged not to give heed to Fables, and to take care that no false Doctrine were taught at *Ephesus*. Now, saith the *Apostle*, If I come not shortly, yet I have written this Epistle that thou maist know how to behave thy self in the Church, which is the House of God, as a Pillar and Support of Truth. What can be more natural and easie, than this Sense? And that there is no Novelty in it appears from hence, that *Gregory Nyssen* expressly delivers this to be the meaning; and many others of the Fathers apply the same

1 Theff. 5. 21.

1 S. John. 4. 1.

1 Tim. 3. 15.

Greg. Nyssen de
vita Mos. p. 226

same Phrases to the great Men of the Church. S. Basil useth the very same Expressions concerning *Musonius*. S. Chrysostom calls the Apostles the *immovable Pillars of the true Faith*. *Theodoret* saith concerning S. Peter and S. John, *That they were the Towers of Godliness, and the Pillars of Truth*. *Gregory Nazianzen* calls S. Basil, *The Ground of Faith, and the Rule of Truth*: And elsewhere, *The Pillar and Ground of the Church*; which Titles he gives to another Bishop at that time. And so it appears in the *Greek Catena*, mentioned by *Heinsius*, S. Basil read these words or understood them so; when he saith, *The Apostles were the Pillars of the New Jerusalem, as it is said, The Pillar and Ground of the Church*. I forbear more, since these are sufficient to shew that they understood this place as relating to *Timothy*, and not to the Church.

Basil. Epist. 62.
Chrysost. Hom. 148. To. 5.
Theod. de Prov. Orat. 10.
p. 441.
Greg. Nazian. Ep. 38.
Orat. 19.
Epist. 20.
Heins. in loc.

As to what he brings of *Scriptures not being of private I.* - Pag. 17. *terpretation*; it is so remote from the Sense and Scope of the Place, which relates wholly to *Divine Inspiration*, that this is a great Instance of that *private Interpretation* which ought to be avoided, viz. of minding only the Words, without regard to the Sense of Scripture.

It was said in the Papers, *That Christ left his Power to his Church, even to forgive Sins in Heaven; and left his Spirit with them, which they exercised after the Resurrection*.

It was farther answered, That all this makes nothing for the *Roman-Catholic Church* not then in being, unless she were Heir-General to the Apostles; that the ordinary Power of the Keys relates not to this matter; that the Promise of the Spirit, made to the Apostles, implied many Gifts not pretended to by this Heir-General, as the Gift of Tongues, Spirit of Discerning, Prophecy, miraculous Cures and Punishments. If no more be understood of Divine Assistance, that is promised as much to keep Men from Sin as Error; but the Church of *Rome* pretends only to the latter; and yet it is granted too, that it may err in matters of great Consequence to the Peace of the Christian World, as in the Deposing Doctrine. This is the Substance of the Answer; let us now see what they Reply.

The force of what the *Defender* saith is this, *That though the Roman Church were not then in being, yet as soon as it was, it was a part of the Catholic Church, to which the Promises were* Def. p. 33.

were made; and therefore the Roman-Catholic Church being the One Church of Christ, these Promises must have their effect in her.

This is all I can make of it; though it cost me more pains to lay their things together with an appearance of strength, than to give an Answer to them.

The Roman Church it seems had not the Promises made to it; but as soon as it was a Church, she was a Part of the Catholic Church. This is very intelligible. Let us then go on. But how come the Promises made to the Catholic Church to belong to the Roman-Catholic? How comes the Roman-Catholic to be the One Church of Christ on Earth? But this is running forwards and backwards. And no good is to be done, without supposing Roman and Catholic to be terms equivalent.

Pag. 33.

He tells me, *I am over-hasty in removing the Power of working Miracles out of the Church.* For, he saith, *God still works Miracles in the Roman Church; and if I would put the whole issue on Miracles, he would undertake the Proof.*

There is nothing in this Case like working of Miracles among us, for our satisfaction. For Miracles are a sign to unbelievers. But it is a pleasant thing, that they should go about to convince us by those things, which they laugh at one another for pretending to. I will give them an Instance past contradiction. Did not the *Jansenists* pretend to a Miracle at *Port-Royal* by one of the *Thorns* of our Saviours Crown? And did not the *Jesuits* expose the very pretence as idle and ridiculous? as appears by *F. Annat's* Book on that Occasion. The late Author of the *Prejudices against the Jansenists*, upon occasion of that Miracle, lays down some good Rules for discerning true Miracles and false. (1.) That such Miracles are not sufficient to convince, which may be effected by a created Power, unless they be attested by such Miracles which can only be effected by a Divine Power; such as Resurrection from the dead. (2.) We must not only attend to the Nature, but to the End of Miracles; which, he saith, is the true worship of God, and the love of Vertue. And by these Rules I shall be content to examine all his Miracles, when ever he produces them.

*Prejugés legit.
c. le Jansenists,
c. 10.*

P ag. 87.

The Assistance which Christ promised, he tells us, was to all his. Pag. 34.
Doctrine, and to all time.

But what a sad thing is it, that we have nothing but his bare saying for the Proof of it! Never Man more needed Infallibility than this *Defender* does, when he undertakes to prove it. What! Can Christ afford no Assistance to his Church without Infallibility? What thinks he of the Assistance of Divine Grace? Doth that make all Infalible that have it? And is not that Assistance by vertue of Divine Promises? *Is this to ask which of the parts of his Promise he will not perform?* We doubt not he will perform all he hath promised, but we desire to see where he hath made the Promise. We ask nothing unreasonable, and therefore out of pity to our weakness, shew these Promises of standing Infallibility to us; and do not take it still for granted without proving it.

But the *Replier* saith, *The Promises of Christ imply whatever is necessary to the Church for the support and government of her self to the Worlds end.* Rep. p. 23.

Is Infallibility then necessary for the Support and Government of the *Catholic Church*? If not, then the Promises of Support and Government relate not to the matter. But no less a Man than *S. Augustine*, frequently affirms, *That the Promises made by Christ to the Church, are only made to good and not to bad Men in it; and that the case of wicked Men in the Church, and of Hereticks and Schismaticks out of it is alike; i. e. that both have true Sacraments, but neither any right to the Promises.* And this he doth not assert by chance, but it is the very Foundation of his Answer to the *Donatists*, in the Answer which himself valued the most.

And he concludes with saying, *That some are in the House of God, so as to be that House of God which was built upon a Rock, and had th Promises made to it; and these are the Saints dispersed over the World, and joyned together in the Communion of the same Sacraments; others are so in the House, as not to belong to the Frame of it; but are as the Chaff among the Wheat; and are rather of the House than any part of it.* If this be good Doctrine in *S. Augustine*, what becomes of all the Promises made to the Church, with respect to the External Government and Support of it?

I might.

L. 5. c. 3. 41,
16, 18, 19, 20,
24. l. 6. c. 28,
29. l. 7. c. 6,
7, 10, 37.

I might name multitudes of Places more, wherein he argues, *That wicked Men do not belong to the One Church; and are not the Spouse of Christ*: for Christ saith to them, *I know you not*; and *Hereticks*, he saith, *are but one sort of bad Men*. If therefore the Promises of the *Catholic Church* do not belong to one, neither can they to the other.

I had therefore Reason to ask, where God hath ever promised to keep Men more from Error than Sin? And how it comes to pass that very bad Men are allow'd in the Church of *Rome* to have this Promise of *Infallibility*?

R. p. p. 23.

John 7. 17.

The *Defender* slides off from this to a matter he was better prepared to Answer. But the *Replier* tells us of *some of the Prophets who were great Sinners*; I suppose he means *Balaam* and *Caiaphas*. But however, this doth not reach to the matter of the *New Testament*, wherein *doing the Will of God* is laid down as the best means of knowing the Truth. But he offers at a Reason why *impeccability* is not so necessary as *Infallibility*, because without this the Church could not subsist; for if once she make shipwreck of her Faith, she is no more a Church, an effect not so proper to Sin. There is a great difference between absolute *impeccability* and *notorious Offenders*; the question I put was not concerning perfect Saints, but great Sinners; why they should believe that Christ would give an infallible Assistance to keep such Men from erring, when notwithstanding the Assistance of Grace, they run on in a course of wickedness? He saith, *One is necessary for the Church, and not the other*. Then there may be a holy Catholic infallible Church made up of none but great Sinners. And was this such a Church as Christ purchased with his own Blood; and whom he redeemed from all impiety to be a peculiar People, zealous of good Works? If they say, *The Grace of God will never fail to keep some from great Sins*; why may not the same hold as to great Errors? And that be as much as the Promises extend to.

But if the Church once makes Shipwreck of Faith, she is no more a Church.

How comes Faith to be separated from a good Conscience? I am sure *S. Paul* joyns them together. Is no Error consistent with the Being of a Church? Not an Error about the

the *Seat of Infallibility*? Not an Error about the *Immaculate Conception*? Nor about the *Vision of God before the day of Judgment*? Not about the Son's being of the same substance with the Father? Not about Christ's having a will proper to his humane Nature? Then there can be no such thing as the Roman-Catholic Church in the opinion of those who are for personal Infallibility of the Pope, since the Heads of their Church have erred about these things. The true Church can never make shipwreck of that Faith which makes her a true Church; But other kind of Errors cannot overthrow her being.

I urged farther, That notwithstanding the pretence to Infallibility, they allow the Church may err in matters of Practice of the highest importance, as about Deposing Princes and Absolving Subjects from their Allegiance; but not about the least matter of Faith; which made it very suspicious to be rather a politick device than a thing they really believed.

Here the *Defender* (I fear wilfully) mistakes my meaning; for he argues as if he thought I were proving, *That the Church of Rome hath defined the Deposing Doctrine as a matter of Faith*; and great pains he takes to prove it hath not. And all to no purpose. For I insisted only, that in this point, they confessed their Church had *grossly erred as to a matter of Practice*, though it had not expressly declared it as an Article of Faith. I desire him to speak out; hath it not erred notoriously as to Practice in this matter? Whether they have made any such Declaration or not, as to oblige all others of their Communion to embrace the Doctrine; it is undeniably true, that their Popes and Councils have owned it and acted according to it, to the mighty disturbance of the Peace of the Christian World. Now the question I put was this, Since it is granted they have so notoriously erred in matters of Practice, why should any believe them Infallible in Points of Faith? *i. e.* that so many Popes, so many Councils, should act upon this principle, as believing it to be true, and yet preserve their Infallibility in not declaring it to be true. This I confess is an extraordinary thing; and the *Defender* seems in earnest

Greg. 7. Epist.
Reg. 4. Ep. 2.

to think they were kept from it *by an over-ruling assistance of the Divine Spirit*. Which is just as if a Man were set upon in the Road by some pretending to be his Friends, who should take from him all that he had, and afterwards he should admire the Providence of God, that these Men should not declare it lawful to do it. It is granted that to many Popes did great Mischief to the World, and especially to Christian Princes, by acting according to this Doctrine, and that they actually owned it in Councils, and made Canons on purpose for it, but yet *an over-ruling Assistance kept them from making it a Point of Faith*. They declared their own belief by their Practice and Canons; they required the observance of them under pain of being cut off from the Church if they did it not; and Gregory VII. saith, *They cut themselves off who question this Power*; but they were deceived, notoriously deceived in this matter, yet they might be Infallible still. Did not these Popes declare that to be Christs Doctrine which is not? *But not Authoritatively*. What I pray doth this mean? Did they not declare this Power by vertue of the Authority given them by Christ over the Church? And declare those Excommunicate who did not obey their Sentence? Is not this proceeding *Authoritatively*? Suppose the Popes had in the same manner declared that Hereticks should be Re-baptized; i. e. made Canons for it, and required the observance of them; I desire to know whether this had not been *Authoritative* declaring it, though they affixed no *Anathema* to those who held the contrary? Is it possible for any Man to believe, that if there were such a thing as Infallibility in the Guides of the Church, that Christ would suffer them to run into such pernicious Errors, and in such an *Authoritative manner*, and yet make good his Promise of keeping them from Error by not suffering them to define this Doctrine as an Article of Faith? But this will appear to be a very slender Evasion, if Men will reflect on the nature of the matter it self; for it is about the exercise of the Pope's Power over Princes; and can it be supposed that since they challenged it, they would ever suffer it to be debated in Councils; but they would still have

have it pass as an inseparable Right of their Supremacy derived from *S. Peter*. And all that they would allow in this Case, is a bare Recognition; and that was made in the Councils of *Lyons* and *Lateran*.

And the Deposing Power in the Church, was sufficiently owned in the Councils of *Constance* and *Trent*.

But there are two sorts of Articles of Faith to be considered in the Church of *Rome*.

1. Some are defined with an *Anathema* against Dissenters; and so we do not say the Deposing Power is made an Article of Faith.

2. Some are received upon the common Grounds of Faith, though not expressly declared. And whatever Doctrine being denied would overthrow them, may be justly look'd on as a Presumptive Article of Faith. As the denying the Deposing Power must charge the Church of *Rome* Representative and Virtual with such acts, as are utterly inconsistent with the Promises of Divine Assistance supposed to be made to it. Therefore all those who sincerely believe those Promises to belong to the Church of *Rome* so taken, must in consequence believe so many Popes and Councils could not be so grossly mistaken in the Ground of their Actings. And I find those who do now most contend that this Doctrine was never defined, do yet yield, that both Popes and Councils believed it to be true, and acted accordingly.

But if nothing will be allowed to be points of Faith, but what passes under the Decision of Councils approved by the Pope as such, I pray tell me, which of the General Councils determined the Popes Supremacy as a Point of Faith? Where was the *Roman Catholic* Churches Infallibility defined? Are these Points of Faith with you, or not? If they be, then there may be Points of Faith among you which never passed any Conciliar Definitions; or such Authoritative Declaration as the *Defender* means.

Pag. 18.

(2.) I now come to consider the Sense of the Primitive Church about this matter of an Infallible Judge of Controversies. Which I am obliged to do, not only because it is said in the Papers, *That the Church exercised this Power after the Apostles*; but because the Defender brings *Tertullian* as rejecting the Scripture from being a sufficient Rule for Controversies; and *S. Augustine*, as setting up the Authority of the Church above the Scripture in matters of Proof.

But I confess two lame sayings of Fathers make no great impression on me. I am for searching the sense of the Primitive Church in so weighty a Point as this, after another manner; (but as briefly as may be) *i.e.* by the general Sense of the Fathers of the first Ages about the Controversies then on foot, that I may not deceive my self or others in a matter of this Consequence.

The point is, Whether according to the sense of the Primitive Church, when any Controversie about Faith doth arise, a Person be bound to submit to the Churches Sentence as Infallible; or he be required to make use of the best means he can to judge concerning it, taking the Scriptures for his Infallible Rule?

Now to judge the Sense of the Primitive Church about this Point, there can be no method more proper or convincing than to consider what Course the Christian Church did take in the Controversies then started, which were great and considerable. And if it had been then believed that Christ had left such an infallible Authority in the Church to have put an end to them; it had been no more possible to have avoided the mention of it, than if a great Cause in Law were to be decided among us, that neither Party should ever take notice of the *Judges in Westminster-Hall*.

There were two very great Controversies in the Primitive Church, which continued a long time under different Names; and we are now to observe what method the Catholic Writers of the Church took for establishing the true Faith.

And

And these were concerning the *Humanity*, and the *Divinity* of *Christ*.

That concerning the *Humanity* of *Christ* begun very early; for *S. John* mentions those who denied that *Iesus* was come in the *Flesh*; i. e. that he really took our Nature upon him. And this *Heretic* did spread very much after the *Apostles* times.

Ignatius made it a great part of the business of his *Epistles* to warn the *Churches* he wrote to, and to arm them against it. And what way doth he take to do it? Doth he ever tell them of the danger of using their own Judgment; or of not relying on the Authority of the Church in this matter? I cannot find one passage tending that way in all his *Epistles*. But instead thereof, he appeals to the Words of our Saviour in the *Evangelist*, *Touch me, and see if I be a Body, or a Spirit*: his words are an incorporeal *Demon*; but it was usual with the ancient Fathers to repeat the Sense of Places, and not the very Words. And a little after he saith, *That these Heretics were not persuaded, neither by the Prophets, nor by the Law, nor by the Gospel*. And he advises the Church of *Smyrna* to attend to the *Prophets*, but especially to the *Gospel*; in which the *Passion* and *Resurrection* of *Christ* are declared.

Irenaeus disputes warmly and frequently against this *Heretic*; and he appeals to the Testimony of the *Apostles* in their Writings; especially to the *Gospels* of *S. John* and *S. Matthew*; but not omitting the other *Gospels* and the *Epistles* of *S. Paul* and *S. John*. And he calls the *Scriptures*, *The *immoveable Rule of Truth*; the *†Foundation and Pillar of our Faith*; and saith, *That *they contain the whole Will of God*. It is true, he makes use of *Tradition* in the Church, to those who rejected the *Scriptures*; and he finds fault with those who took words and pieces of *Scripture* to serve their turn; but he directs to the right use of it, and doth not seem to question the sufficiency thereof, for the satisfaction of humble and teachable minds in all the points of Faith, which were then controverted.

Tertullian undertakes the same Cause in several Books and several ways. One is by shewing that the Opinion of the Hereticks was novel; not being consistent with the Doctrine delivered by the Apostles, as appeared by the unanimous consent of the Apostolical Churches; which did all believe Christ had a true and real Body. And this way he made use of, because those Hereticks either rejected, or interpolated, or perverted the Books of Scripture. But this way of *Prescription* look'd like *Out-Lawing* of Hereticks and never suffering them to come to a fair Trial. Therefore in his other Books he goes upon three substantial Grounds. (1.) That the Books of Scripture do certainly deliver the Doctrine of the Christian Church concerning Christ's having a true Body. (2.) That these Books of Scripture were not counterfeited, nor corrupted and adulterated; but preserved genuine and sincere in the Apostolical Churches. (3.) That the sense which the Hereticks put upon the Words of Scripture was forced and unreasonable; but the sense of the Church was true and natural. So that *Tertullian* did conclude, that there was no way to end this Controversie but by finding out the true sense of Scripture.

De Carne Christi, &c. Marcion. &c. Valentin.

Def. p. 18.
De Prescript.
c. 17.

But the Author of the *Defence* brings in *Tertullian*, as representing all trial of Doctrine by Scripture, as good for nothing but to turn the Brain or the Stomach; and that the issue is either uncertain or none.

I grant *Tertullian* hath those words; but for Truths sake I wish he had not left out others, viz. That those Hereticks do not receive some Scriptures; and those they do receive they add and alter as they please. And what, saith he, can the most skilful in Scriptures do with those who will defend or deny what they think fit? With such indeed, he saith, it is to little purpose to dispute out of Scriptures. And no doubt he was in the right; for the Rule must be allow'd on both sides; or else there can be nothing but a wrangling about it. The first thing then here, was to settle the Rule, and for this the Testimony of the Apostolical Churches was of great use. But to imagine that *Tertullian* rejected all trial of Doctrines by Scripture, is to make him to write to little purpose afterwards; when he combates with all sorts of Hereticks
out

out of *Scripture*, as appears by his Books against *Marcion*, *Praxeas*, *Hermogenes* and others. And *Tertullian* himself saith,

That if we bring Hereticks only to Scripture, they cannot stand. Not because they went only upon Reason; but in the end of the same Treatise he saith, *They made use of Scriptures too, but such as were to be confuted by other Scriptures.* And therefore he makes the Hereticks to decline, as much as in them lay, *the Light of the Scriptures*; which he would never have charged on others, if he thought himself that Controversies could not be ended by them.

Clement Alexandrinus speaking of the same Heresies, makes the Controversie to consist chiefly about the Scriptures, whether they were to be embraced and followed, or not. He saith. None of the Heresies among Christians had so darken'd the Truth, but that those who would might find it; and the way he advises to, is a diligent search of the Scriptures; wherein the Demonstration of our Faith doth consist; and by which, as by a certain Criterion, we are to judge of the truth and falsehood of opinions. Which he there insists upon at large. He speaks indeed of the Advantage of the Church above Heresies, both as to Antiquity and Unity; but he never makes the Judgment of the Church to be the Rule of Faith, as he doth the Scriptures.

In the *Dialogue* against the *Marcionists*, supposed to be *Origen's*, this Controversie is briefly handled, the point is brought to the *Sense of Scripture*; as in that place, *the Word was made Flesh*; from which, and other places the Catholic argues the *Truth of Christ's humane Nature*; especially from Christ's appealing to the sense of his Disciples about the Truth of his Body after the Resurrection. All his *Demonstrations* are out of *Scripture*, and by the meer force of them he overthrows this Heresie. And it was nothing but the clear Evidence of *Scripture*, without any Infallible Judgment or Assistance of the Guides of the Church, which did at last suppress this Heresie. For no Council was called about it, but as the Authority

Aufer denique Hæreticis quæ cum Ethnicis sapiunt, ut de Scripturis solis quæstiones suas fistant, & stare non poterunt. De Resur. Carnis, c. 3.

*Hærefes autem sine aliquibus occa-
sionibus Scripturarum audere non po-
terant; ideo pristinæ instrumenta
quasdam materias illis videntur sub-
ministrasse, & ipsas quidem iisdem
literis revincibiles. c. 63.*

Lucifugæ isti Scripturarum, c. 47.

Clem. Alex.

Strom. i. 7.

P.755.

'Οὐ κερύπερον
 ἔποσεν· ἡ Ζη-
 τήν τις δ' Ἀ-
 λήθεια, πρὶν
 αὖ δ' ἀπο-
 δεῖξιν αὐτὸ
 αὐτῶν λάβω-
 σθ' ἢ χαρῶν.
 ib. ε' 757.

Orig. Dial. c.

Marcionist.

§. 4. p. 108.

p. 101.

Theod. ad he-
ret. Fab. Pref.
c. l. 2. p. 218.

thority of the *New Testament* prevailed, so this Heresie declined, and by degrees vanished out of the Christian World. And it is observable, That the greatest and worst of Heresies were suppress'd, while no other Authority was made use of against them but that of the *holy Scriptures*. So *Theodoret* takes notice, That before his time these Heresies by Divine Grace were extinct. So that the Scriptures were then found an effectual means for putting an end to some of the most dangerous Heresies which ever were in the Christian Church.

The other great Controversie of the first Age, was about the *Divinity of Christ*; which begun with the *Ebionites* and *Cerinthians*, and was continued down by succession, as appears by *Theodoret's* account of Heresies in his second Book. Those who first embraced this Heresie reject'd the whole *New Testament*, and received only the *Nazarene Gospel*. But after a while *Artemon* had the boldness to assert that the Apostles deliver'd the same Doctrine in their Writings, and then the Controversie was reduced to the *Sense of Scripture*. *Paulus Samosatenus* follow'd *Artemon*, as *Photinus* afterwards follow'd him. But *Theodoret* again observes, That all those Heresies against the *Divinity of Christ* were in his time so extinct, that not so much as any remainders of them were left; but saith he, The true Doctrines of the Gospels prevail and spread themselves over the World. And we may find what course was taken for putting an end to this Controversie, by the management of it with *Paulus Samosatenus*. In the fragment of an Epistle of *Dionysius of Alexandria*, we read the Testimonies of Scripture which he produced against him; and more at large in the Epistle of the Six Bishops to him; who makes use of the very same Places of Scripture which are most applied to that purpose to this day. To which they only add, That this had been the Doctrine of the Christian Church from the beginning; and all Catholic Churches agreed in it. But here is no such thing thought of as *Infallibility* in the Guides of the Church; for there is great difference between the consent of the Christian Church, as a means to find out the Sense of Scripture, and the Authority of Church Guides declaring the Sense by virtue of an *Infallible Assistance*; the one is but a Moral Argument, and the other is a Foundation of Faith.

Theodoret further observes, *That there was another set of Heresies distinct from the two former in the Primitive Church, which related chiefly to matters of Discipline and Manners; and most of these, he saith, were so far destroyed, that there were none then left, who were Followers of Nicolas, Nepos, or Patroclus, and very few Novatians, or Montanists, or Quartodecemans; so that Truth had prevailed over the World, and the Heresies were either quite rooted out, or only some dry and withered Branches remained of them in remote and obscure Places.*

Hæret. Fab. l. 3. p. 226, 231.

Which being affirmed by a Person of so much Judgment and Learning, as Theodoret was, gives us a plain and evident Proof, that the Sense of Scripture may be so fully clear'd, without an *Infallible Church*, as to be effectual for putting an end to Controversies.

And altho we own a great Esteem and Reverence for the Four General Councils; yet we cannot but observe, that Controversies were so far from being ended by them, that they broke out more violently after them. As the Arian Controversy after the Council of Nice; the Nestorian after that at Ephesus; and these Gentlemen believe that Heresy continues still in the East: the Euxychian Controversy gave greater Disturbance after the Council of Chalcedon, than before, and continued so to do for many Ages: Which is an Argument that the Infallibility of Councils, or of the Guides of the Church, was not a Doctrine then received in the Church.

But I proceed to shew what means were used in the Primitive Church for putting an end to Controversies. Of which we have a remarkable Instance in the Dispute about Re baptizing Hereticks. This was managed between St. Cyprian and other Bishops of Africa and Asia, on one side, and the Bishop of Rome on the other. He pleaded Custom and Tradition: the other, *That Custom without Truth was but ancient Error; and that the matter ought to be examined by Scripture; and many Reasons they bring from thence; because Christ said in his Gospel, I am Truth; and the only way to prevent Errors, is to have recourse to the Head and Fountain of Divine Tradition, i. e. to the Holy Scriptures; which St. Cyprian calls the Evangelical and Apostolical Tradition.* So that we have the clear Opinion of the African Bishops, that this Controversy ought to be decided by Scripture. But here the Replier saith, *That Right stood for the Bishops of Rome, Reply, p. 13.*

St. Cyprian, Epist. 74, 75.

and a General Council determined the Point, and the whole Church came to an Acquiescence. If the Council was in the Right, the Bishop of Rome was not; if St. Cyprian represent his Opinion truly, and he saith he did it in his own Words, which are, *Si quis a quacunque Hæresi venerit ad nos, nihil innovetur nisi quod Traditum est.* Now, no Council ever determin'd so, That whatsoever the Heresy was, none should be Rebaptized. For the Councils of Arles and Nice both disallow'd the Baptism of some Hereticks; and therefore, if the Council put an end to the Controversy, it was by deciding against the Bishop of Rome, as well as St. Cyprian.

The Donatists afterwards made use of St. Cyprian's Authority in this Controversy, which gave occasion to St. Augustin, to deliver that noted Sentence, concerning Scripture and Fathers, and Councils, viz That Canonical Scripture is to be preferr'd before any other Writings, for they are to be believ'd without Examination; but the Writings of Bishops are to be examined and corrected by other Bishops and Councils, if they see Cause; and lesser Councils by greater, and the greatest Councils, by such as come after them, when Truth comes to be more fully discovered. It is hardly possible for a Man to speak plainer against a standing infallible Judge in Controversies, than St. Augustin doth in these Words, wherein he neither limits his Words to matters of Fact, nor to Manners; but he speaks generally, as to the Authority of the Guides of the Church compared with Scripture. Which are enter'd in the Authentick Body of the Canon Law, approved and corrected at Rome, only that part which relates to the correcting of Councils, is left out. But to make amends, Gratian in another place, hath with admirable Ingenuity, put the Popes Decretal Epistles among the Canonical Scriptures, and quotes St. Augustin for it too. But the Roman Correctors were ashamed of so gross a Forgery, and confess St. Augustin never thought of the Decretal Epistles, but of the Canonical Scriptures; but yet they let the Title stand for good Canon Law.

In the Controversy about the Church with the Donatists, St. Augustin's constant appeal is to the Scriptures; and he sets aside, not only particular Doctors, but the pretence to Miracles, and the Definitions of Councils. He doth not therefore appeal to Scripture, because they disputed about the Church: but because he looked on the Testimonies of Scripture, as clear enough to decide the point,

Aug. de Bapt.
c. Donatist. l. 2.
c. 3.

Decr. Dist. 9.
c. 8.

Dist. 19. c. 6.

De unir. Eccl.
c. 3. 4. 6.

point, as he often declares. And he calls the plain Testimonies of Scripture, the support and strength of their Cause. If he then thought that Scripture alone could put an end to such a Controversy as that, no doubt he thought so as to any other. But we need not mention his thoughts, for he declares as much: whether it be about Christ or his Church, or any matter of Faith, he makes Scripture so far the Rule, that he denouncess *Anathema against those who deliver any other Doctrine than what is contained in them.* Nor doth he direct to any Church Authority to manifest the Sense of Scripture, but leaves all Mankind to judg of it, and even the *Donatists* themselves whom he opposed. The same way he takes with *Maximinus the Arian*, He desires all other Authorities may be laid aside, and only those of Scripture and Reason used. To what purpose, unless he thought the Scripture sufficient to end the Controversy?

Against *Fauftus the Manichean*, he saith, *The Excellency of the Canonical Scripture is such, as to be placed in a Throne far above all other Writings, to which every faithful and pious Mind ought to submit. All other Writings are to be tried by them; but there is no doubt to be made of whatever we find in them.*

The same method he uses with the *Pelagians*, and advises them to yield to the Authority of Scripture, which can neither deceive nor be deceived. This Controversy, saith he, requires a Judg; let Christ judg, let us hear him speak. Let the Apostle judg with him, for Christ speaks in his Apostles. And in another place, Let St. John sin judg between us.

And in general he saith, *We ought to Acquiesce in the Authority of Scripture; and when any Controversy arises, it ought to be quietly ended by Proofs brought from thence.*

But St. *Augustin* is the Man, whom the Defender produces against me; because against the *Manicheans*, he saith, he believed the Scripture for the sake of the Church; and to bring any proof out of Scripture against the Church, does weaken that Authority, upon which he believed the Scripture, and so he could believe neither. The meaning wherof is this, St. *Augustin* was reduced from being a *Manichean* to the *Catholic Church* by many Arguments; and by the Authority of the Church delivering the Books of Scripture, he embraced the Gospel, which before he did not. Now, saith he, You would make use of this Gospel to prove *Manichæus* an Apostle, I can by no means yield to this way. Why so? Do not you believe it to be Gospel? Yes, saith he; but the same reason which moved me to embrace this Gospel, moved me to reject

A Vindication of the Answer

Manichæus, and therefore I have no reason to allow a Testimony cut of it for *Manichæus*. Not that St. *Augustine* feared any proof that could be brought from thence ; but he begins with general *Topicks*, as *Tertullian* did against the Hereticks of his time, before he came to close with them. And such was this which he here produces. For in case *Manichæus* his Name had been in the Gospel as an *Apostle of Christs appointing*, this Argument of St. *Augustine* had not been sufficient. For there might be sufficient reason from the Churches Authority to embrace the Gospel ; and yet if the Scripture had been plain, he ought to have believed *Manichæus* his *Apostleship*, though the Church disowned it. As I will prove by an undeniable Instance : Suppose a *Jewish* Profelyte to have argued just after the same manner against *Jesus being the Messias* ; the Apostles go about to prove that he was so, by the Testimony of the Prophets : No, saith he, I can allow no such Argument : because the same Authority of the *Jewish Church*, which perswaded me to believe the Prophets, doth likewise perswade me not to believe *Jesus to be the Messias*. If it be so far from holding in this case, neither can it in the other. For it proceeds upon a very feeble Supposition, that no Church can deliver a Book for Canonical, but it must judg aright concerning all things relating to it. Which unavoidably makes the *Jewish Church* infallible at the same time it condemned *Christ* as a Deceiver. But this was only a witty velitation in St. *Augustine*, used by Rhetoricians, before he entered into the Merits of the Cause. And it is very hard when such sayings shall at every turn be quoted, against his more mature and well weighed judgment.

Def p. 2.

What noise is there made in the world with that one saying of his, *I should not believe the Gospel, unless the Authority of the Catholick Church moved me* ? And the Defender brings it to prove the Church more visible than Scripture. Whereas, he means no more by it, but that the authority of the Church was greater to him, than that of *Manichæus*. For he had been swayed by his authority to reject the Gospel ; and now he rejects that authority, and believes the Catholick Church rather than him. And this doth not make the Churches authority greater than Scripture, but more visible than that of *Manichæus*.

But if St. *Augustin's* Testimony here be allowed to extend farther, yet it implies no more than that the constant, universal Tradition of the Scripture by the Catholick Church, makes it appear credi-

credible to us. What can be deduced hence as to the Churches Infallibility in interpreting Scripture, or the Roman Churches authority in delivering it?

The *Arrian* Controversie gave a great disturbance to the Christian Church; and no less a man than the Emperour *Constantine* thought there was no such way to put an end to it, as to search the Scriptures about it; As he declared to the Council of *Nice* at their meeting, as *Theodoret* saith. It is true, he spake to the Guides of the Church assembled in Council, but his words are remarkable, viz: That the Books of Scripture do plain'y instruct us what we are to believe concerning the Deity, if we search them with peaceable minds. Methinks *Bellarmino* bestows no great Complement on *Constantine* for this saying, when he saith, He was a great Emperour, but no great Doctor. This had been indeed sawcy and scurrilous in others, but it was no doubt good manners in him.

Theod. l. i. c. 6.

Bellar. de Ver. Dei, l. 4. c. 11.

St. Hilary commends his Son *Constantius*, because he would have this Controversie ended by the Scriptures; and he desires to be heard by him about the sense of the Scriptures concerning it; which he was ready to shew, not from new Writings, but from Gods Word.

Hilar. l. 2. ad Constant.

Athanasius seems to question the usefulness of Councils in this matter, because the Scripture of it self was sufficient to put an end to it. And elsewhere saith, that it is plain enough to those who search for Truth. And in general he asserts their sufficiency and clearness for the discovery of Truth.

Athanas. de Synodis. Tom. 1. p. 873. Tom. 2. p. 197. Tom. 1. c. Grat.

When a Controversie was raised in *St. Basil's* time about the Trinity, the best Expedient that great man could think of for putting an end to it, was to refer it to the Scriptures. In another place he commends it as the best way to find out Truth, to be much in the study of the Scriptures; and saith that the Spirit of God did thereby lead to all things useful.

Basil. Epist. 80. Tom. 3. Epist. 1, & 284.

Epiphanius was well acquainted with all the Heresies of the Church, and the best means to suppress them; and certainly he would never have taken such pains to refute so many Heresies out of Scripture, if he had look'd on the Church as the Infallible Judg of Controversies. For he not only undertakes to give the sense of Scripture for the ending of Controversies, but he supposes all Persons capable of understanding it, that will apply themselves to it. Which he several times affirms in the confutation of his last Heresie:

Hæc. 75 p. 923. 943, 989.

I shall conclude with *St. Chrysostome*, who speaks to this purpose, to a person so offended at the Sects and Heresies among Christians, that

Chrysost. in
Acta Apost.
Hom. 33.

In Joh. Hom.
53
1b, Hom. 58

that he did not know whom or what to believe: *The Scriptures, saith he, are plain and true, and it is an easie matter to judg by them; if a man agrees with the Scriptures, he is a Christian; if not, he is out of that Roll.* But men differ about the sense of Scripture. *What, saith he, have ye not a mind and judgment? And after the answering several other Cavils, he concludes, Let us submit to the Divine Law, and do what is pleasing to that, and that will bring us to Heaven.* And in another place, *If we study the Scriptures, we shall understand both true Doctrine and a good life.* And again, *the Scriptures are the Door which keep out Hereticks, which establish our minds in the Truth, and suffer us not to be seduced.*

Thus I have given somewhat a clearer view of the *sense* of the *Primitive Church* in this matter, than could be taken from two single passages of *Tertullian* and *St. Augustin*; and I have been so far from swelling or enlarging this as far as I could, that I have made choice only of these, out of many others which I could have produced. But if these be not sufficient, a Volume will not satisfy; which it were not hard to make on this Subject, out of the Fathers.

(3) It is time now to examine the *Inconveniencies* alledged against Persons judging of matters of Faith according to the Scriptures:

(1) *That God Almighty would then leave us at Uncertainties, if he gave us a Rule, and left every one to be his own Judg; for that were to leave every phantastical man to chuse as he pleases.*

To this was answered, (1) That this Objection doth not reach those of the *Church of England*, which receives the three Creeds, and embraces the four General Councils, and professes to hold nothing contrary to any Universal Tradition of the Church from the Apostles times. And that we have often offer'd to put the Controversies between us and the *Church of Rome* upon that issue.

Reply, p. 18

To this Answer the Replier saith, *That they do not charge our Church with not professing these things, but for erring against her own Profession, and deserting that Church to which all these Authorities bear Testimony, and of which her Progenitors and first Reformers had been Members, and from whose hands she received whatsoever she had, either of Scripture, Creeds, Councils or Tradition, and consequently whose judgment she was bound to follow.*

Whether we act against our Profession or not, it is plain the Rule of our Church doth not by this Profession leave every one to follow his own fancy, and to believe as he pleases. But wherein is it that we thus *Act* against our Profession? Do we reject the Creeds, Councils, and Universal Tradition in our Deeds? Wherein? In deserting the Communion of the Church of Rome? And is the necessity of that contained in the Creeds here receiv'd? In the four Councils? By Universal Tradition? For this I refer to the foregoing Discourse about the Unity of the Catholick Church. But we receiv'd these things from the Church of Rome. So we do the old Testament from the Jews, must we therefore hold Communion still with them? Are we bound therefore to follow the Judgment of the Jewish Church? But I do not understand how we receiv'd these things from the Authority of the Church of Rome. We receiv'd the Scriptures from Universal Tradition derived from all the Apostolical Churches; and so the Creeds and Councils; and such an Universal Tradition is the thing we desire; for the *Trent-Creed*, our forefathers never knew or receiv'd as part of that Faith without which there is no Salvation.

But here the Defender grows brisk, and saith, *All Hereticks since the first four General Councils, may say the very same which I say for the Church of England; and all before them the Equivalent. Arius, Macedonius, Nestorius, and Eutyches, might have said as much of the Creeds before them; and all complain of the Villainous Factions in the Church against them. My Plea for the Church of England hath justified them all. [The same thing is said in fewer words by the Replier.] That this Plea justifies the Arrians, and condemns the Nicene Fathers, vindicates the Eutychians, Nestorians, and Donatists, and confounds all General Councils.*

Def: p. 21:

Reply, p. 19

Left therefore I should seem to betray the Church of England, instead of defending it, I shall shew the Reasonableness and Equity of this Plea, and its great difference from that of the Ancient Hereticks condemned by General Councils, or the Ancient Church.

(1) The Ancient Hereticks were condemned by that Rule of Faith which the Church always receiv'd, viz. the Scriptures; but the Council of Trent set up a new Rule of Faith on purpose that they might condemn us for Hereticks, viz. in making Tradition equal with Scripture, which is directly contrary to the Doctrine of the Primitive Church; as I have already shewed. The method of General Councils was to have the Books of Scripture placed in the

Act. Synodi
Eph. p. 175.
Hist. Concil.
To. 1. p. 498.

the middle of them on a Table, as the Rule they were to judge by. And *Richerius*, a Doctor of the *Sorbon*, not only affirms the Custom, but saith it was for ~~this~~ Reason, *That the Fathers of the Councils might be admonished, that all things were to be examined by the standard of the Gospel.*

Bellarmin Concil.
1. 2. c. 12.

Bellarmin affirms the Council of *Nice*, *To have drawn its Conclusion out of Scriptures*; and the same he affirms of the 6th General Council; and he might as well have done it of the rest; their main design, being only to establish the Doctrine of the Divinity and Incarnation of Christ. But the Case of Councils came to be very different, when they took upon them to define other matters for which they had no Colour in Scripture (as the 2d Council of *Nice* did, which was the first that went upon Tradition) and then the Christian Church did not shew such Respect to them; as was most apparent in the Case of this Council of *Nice*, which was universally rejected in these *Western* parts, (*Rome* excepted) as appears by the Council of *Frankford*, and the unexceptionable Testimonies of *Eghinardus*, *Hincmarus*, and others. Would this have been a sufficient Argument against *Charlemaign* and the *Western* Bishops, that they joyned in the Plea of the *Ancient Hereticks*, and none were ever condemned by the Church, but they made such complaints against the Proceedings of Councils, as they did? It is certain that *Leo Armenus* in the *East*, as well as *Charles*, and the *Western* Church, rejected that Council, *as contrary to Scripture*; which shews that neither in the *East* or *West*, did they think themselves so tied up by Definitions of Councils, proceeding in such a manner; but that they were at full Liberty to examine, and if they saw Cause, to reject such Definitions. While Councils did declare, that they intended to make use of no other Rule but Scripture, and to deliver only the Sense of the Catholick Church from the beginning, a great regard was to be shew'd to them: but when they set up another Rule, the Christian Church had just Reason not to submit to their Decrees. And to say, *This is the Plea of all Hereticks*, is just as if an innocent Person might not be allowed to plead *not Guilty*, because the greatest Malefactors do the same. There must be some certain Rules whereby to proceed in this matter: and this is the first We fix upon, That they proceed as the Ancient Councils did according to Scriptures.

Niceph. cum
Leone Arme-
no Disput. ed.
Combesis, p.
162.

(2.) The Ancient Hereticks were condemned by such Councils, as did represent the *Universal Church* after another manner, than the *Council of Trent* did. I do not say, There was ever such a *General Council*, as did fully represent the *Universal Church*, which could not be done without *Provincial Councils* summon'd before in all parts of Christendom, and the Delegation from them of such Persons as were to deliver their Sense in the matter of Faith, to be debated in the *General Council*; and I have Reason to question whether this were ever done. But however, there is a very great difference in the *Ancient Councils* from the modern, as to this point of *Representing*; for in them there was the Consent of all the *Patriarchs*, and a general Summons for the *Bishops* from all parts to appear. But in the *Modern Councils*, *four Patriarchs*, and the *Bishops* under them, have been excluded; and the *5th* hath summon'd the *Bishops* under him to meet together, and then hath called this a *General Council*. Which is just as if in the time of the *Heptarchy*, the King of *Mercia* should assemble the *States* under him, and call the *Convention* of them, *The Parliament of England*. Thus in the *Council of Trent*, the Pope Summons the *Bishops* that owned his Supremacy, and had taken Oaths to him, to meet together, and would have this pass for a *General Council*. When the Council met, and Cardinal *Hosius* was appointed President in it; *Stanislaus Orechovius*, a warm and zealous *Romanist*, writes to *Hosius*, That it would very much conduce to their Reputation and Interest, if the *Patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch*, were Summon'd to the Council, because the *Greeks and Armenians* depended upon them: And he could not understand how the *Catholic Church* could be Represented without them, nor how the Council could be called *Oecumenical*. To which *Hosius* Replied, That the Pope being *Oecumenical Patriarch*, a Council called by him, was an *Oecumenical Council*. Now this we say, is extremely different from the Notion of an *Oecumenical Council* in the *Ancient times*, and overthrows the Rights of other Churches, as they were settled by the *Four General Councils*; and therefore the Case is very different as to being condemn'd by *General Councils*, and by the late *Conventions* assembled by the *Popes Authority*.

(3.) Themselves allow that some Councils may be, and ought to be rejected; and therefore all our business is to enquire whether we may not with as much Reason reject some Councils, as they do others. They reject the Council of *Ariminum*, which together

Hof. Oper. p. 373.
Quandoquidem solus ille verè dicitur & est Oecumenicus patriarcha, quod Concilium ipsius ille Auctoritate Congregatum, id verè dicitur oecumenicum.

De Concil. l.
1. c. 6.

with that of *Seleucia* (which sat at the same time) make up the most General Council we read of in Church-History. For *Bellarmin* owns that *there were 600. Bishops in the Western part of it.* So that there were many more Bishops assembled than were in the Council of *Nice*; there was no Exception against the Summons, or the Bishops present; and yet the Authority of this Council is rejected, because it was too much influenced by *Constantius*, and his Agents. The 2d Council of *Ephesus* wanted no just Summons, no presence of Patriarchs, or number of Bishops, yet this is rejected, *because its Proceedings were too Violent.* The Councils of *Constantinople* against Images are rejected; because, but *one Patriarch* was present in either of them. Now I desire to know, whether it be not as lawful to except against other Councils, as against these, supposing the Reasons to be the same; and greater Evidence to be given in these latter Times, of the Truth of the Allegations. Besides, we find they are divided in the Church of *Rome*, concerning their latter Councils: Some say, The Councils of *Pisa*, *Constance* and *Basil*, were true General Councils, and that the Council of *Lateran* under *Leo X.* was not so; others say, That the former have not the Authority of General Councils, but the latter hath. Some say, That there have been 18. General Councils; so the *Roman* Editors of the Councils, and others; but a great number of these are rejected by others, who allow but 8. of the number, *viz.* those wherein the *Eastern* and *Western* Bishops met. And so the Councils of *Lateran* and *Trent*, besides others, are cut off. What becomes then of the Articles of Faith, defined by those Councils? For they cannot be received on the account of their Authority. However, we find this Objection lies equally against them, as against us. For, do not both these differing Parties side with the *Ancient Hereticks*, as much as we do? For they except against the *Supreme Judicature* in the Church, and decline the Judgment of these Councils, as much as those Hereticks did the Councils of their own Times.

These are therefore but ordinary *Topics*, which may be reasonable or not, as they are applied.

(2.) It was answer'd, That the way proposed, doth not hinder mens believing as they please, *i. e.* without sufficient Reason for their Faith; several Instances were given: As, believing the *Roman* Church to be the Catholick, without any colour of Scripture, Reason or Antiquity; (as is now fully shew'd in the foregoing Discourse) believing against the most convincing Evidence of their own

own Senses. Believing the lawfulness of the Worship of Images can be reconciled with Gods forbidding it; the Communion in one Kind with Christs Institution; and Praying in an unknow Tongue, with the 14. Chapter of the first Epistle to the *Corinthians*.

To this the Replier saith only, *that these are voluntary assumpti* Repl. p. 8
ons without proof: and his saying so, needs no Answer.

The Defender shelters himself under the *Catholick Church*, and Def. p. 23
resolves not to put to Sea with the Answerer about these things. But he knows very well, we utterly deny any of these to have been the practice of the Universal Church according to *Vincentius Lerinensis* his Rules; by which we are content to be tried. And although he seems to wish for such a trial, yet I know a reason why they ought to decline it, because I am certain they can never make it good in any one of them.

(2) The second Inconvenience objected was, *That this would make the wisdom of God fall beneath the discretion of prudent Law-givers; who do not make Laws, and leave every man to be his own judge as to right or wrong.*

It was answered three ways:

(1) That there are Inconveniencies on both sides, and one ought to be provided against, as well as the other; for as the people are not to be their own Judges, so it may happen that an Usurper may pretend to the right of Interpreting the Laws, only to justify his Usurpation.

(2) That the People are allowed in some sense to interpret the Laws, or else they could never understand the duty they owe to their lawful King, and to justify his Rights against all the pretences of Usurpers.

To this the Replier saith nothing, and the Defender saith that which is next to nothing to the first, and takes no notice of the second Answer; and I think I therein tell him plainly enough, what I would be at. He saith, *I mean receiving and holding the true faith by* Def. p. 24.
Usurpation. Nothing was farther from my thoughts. But I had thought it were easie enough to know whom I meant, *viz.* such a one as pretends to an Infallible Chair, which they cannot deny themselves to be the highest Usurpation, if he cannot prove his Title by Scripture, as we are sure he cannot.

(3) That in this Case a Rule is given to direct persons in the way to Heaven, and therefore must be capable of being understood by those who are to make use of it for that end. Which being

A Vindication of the Answer

ing the greatest concernment to Mankind, they are therefore obliged to search into it for their own Salvation; but we exclude not the help of Spiritual Guides, and embrace the ancient Creeds of the Church.

To this the Replier answers two things:

(1) *That an Infallible Guide is necessary to secure persons from wilful Errors, which he saith God hath provided. From wilful Error!* this is new Doctrine indeed, *that God hath provided a remedy for wilful Error.* Had not our Saviour himself an Infallible Spirit, and yet we do not read that ever he secured men from wilful Error? or ever designed to do it. But suppose an Infallible Judg could do this, he doth not tell us where he is to be found, who he is, and in what manner he doth thus secure men, which are very necessary Enquiries; and without being satisfied in all these points, we are still left to be our own Judges, so far as concerns the way to Salvation; since at the day of Judgment we must answer for our selves, than which there can be no greater obligation to care and sincerity in judging. Suppose a mans life depends upon the benefit of his Clergy, and one comes to him and tells him, You are an ignorant man, and liable to great mistakes in reading, therefore I advise you by no means to trust to your own skill in Reading, for it is a horrible dark Letter, and many have been mistaken that were more *Book-learned* than you; therefore take my counsel, there is Mr. *Ordinary* who understands *Book-learning* a thousand times better than you or I, trust him for the Reading, and no doubt you will escape. Ay, Sir, saith the man, all that is very true that you say, but my life lies at stake; and how if Mr. *Ordinary's* Reading will not be allow'd by the Judg for mine, then I am a lost man past recovery; therefore I am resolved to learn to read my self; and to that end I will make the best use of his skill to instruct me before-hand that I may be able to answer for my self. This needs no Application.

But I do not see how an Infallible Guide should be necessary to particular persons in order to their Salvation, upon the Principles owned and receiv'd by the greatest Divines in the *Roman Church*. For *Aquinas* determines that every one that hath saving Grace, hath likewise a gift of understanding whereby he is sufficiently instructed in all things necessary to Salvation, and that it is never wish-
Circa ea quæ sunt de necessitate salutis, sufficienter instruantur à Spiritu sancto, 2, 2 Qu. 8 ar. 4 ad: 1. Donum Intellectus nunquam se subtrahit sanctis circa ea quæ sunt necessaria ad salutem; ib: ad 3.

drawn from them, as to those things. If this Doctrine hold good, I do not see any such necessity for persons to look after an Infallible Guide, as there is to look after saving Grace.

Gulielmus Parisiensis saith, That mens not looking after the way of Gul. Parisiens. Salvation themselves, is that which will damn them. And in case of de Legibus c: difference among Guides, if a man sincerely makes application to God, to 21 p: 57, 58: know the Truth he doth not question but such is the mercy of God to keep such a one from dangerous Error; or if he doth suffer him to fall into Error with a good mind, it shall not be imputed to him. It is a Doctrine generally receiv'd in the Schools, That where ever God doth bestow his Grace, there goes along with it such a gift of understanding, as keeps them from being deceived in the matters they believe in order to Salvation. Pag: 59 D.Col. 1.
Henricus a Gandavo thus expresses it, That as Faith Henr. a Gand. makes the mind to rest on the Authority of the Scripture, so this gift of Sum. Art. 13. understanding makes them perceive the Truth of what they are to believe. Q. 4. n. 3.
And what need then such an Infallible-Guide?

(2) He saith, That ancient Creeds will not serve, unless there be a power in the Church to make new decisions in matters of Faith.

This ought to have been a little proved. For in truth we are apt to think the Faith once delivered to the Saints as sufficient to carry us to Heaven, as it was in the Apostles times. A man is heir to a good Estate, which by many Generations is derived down from his Ancestors, and he hath the Original Deeds in his hands; one comes to him and tells him, It is a very fine Estate you are heir to, and it is a thousand pities you should want a good Title to it; I will put you into a way to get it, if you will give up your musty old Deeds, and put your self into the hands of such persons as I shall name to you, they shall make you a new Settlement, and add several Parcels to your Estate which you had not before. I am content, saith the Heir, with my Ancestors Estate, and I will never part with my old Deeds for all your new Settlements; for I am sure my Ancestors would never deceive me; but I know not what designs you with your new Settlements may have upon me, and therefore I pray let me alone with my old Deeds.

The Defender here dances upon Ropes, he makes swift and quick Def. p. 26 motions, but he stands on a slender bottom, and he knows not whereon to fix, but would seem to say something, but not enough to afford scope for an Answer. That which he aims at, is, That unless a man by judging controversies by the Infallible Rule, be able to come to an Infallible Determination, then controversies will not be infallibly

A Vindication of the Answer

fallibly determined, if every man be left to be his own *Judg.* And I am clearly of his mind. But the point is, whether such an infallible determination of Controversies be the necessary way to Heaven? If a man can judg well enough to carry him thither, that is as much as I am concerned for at present.

P. 27:

But he goes on. *Who can hope to be saved without pleasing God? and every body knows that without Faith it is impossible to please him.* There wants only one little thing to be added, and without an *Infallible Judg of Controversies*, there can be no *Faith*. But this was forgotten.

But after all he saith, I confess that *Scripture is not the Rule of Controversies*. I pray why? for I take it not only to be the *Rule*, but to be the *only Rule*. For, saith he, *they are not ended till one side or other be certain.* What then? is there no *Rule* that doth not put an end to Controversies? Nay their own Writers say a *Rule*, as a *Rule* cannot put an end to them, and therefore a *Judg* is necessary. But I must answer such things as they bring.

In matters of good and evil, I said every mans conscience is his immediate *Judg*, and why not in matters of truth and falshood; unless we suppose mens involuntary mistakes to be more dangerous than their wilful sins.

Here the *Defender* triumphs. *How?* saith he, *are we before we are aware come to conscience at last?* I heartily wish we were, that would tend more to the ending of controversies than an *Infallible Judg*.

But he wonders that in Disputes of Religion it should before we are aware come to conscience at last. Good man! he was not aware that there was any thing of conscience in the matter. Doth he think it is only matter of interest we contend about? so those who believe no Religion themselves, think all controversies about Religion, to have nothing of conscience in them.

P. 28.

But after a long harangue, he saith, *That conscience can do no more than secure a man from being judged for sinning against his conscience: But if it lead him to do ill things, or embrace a wrong Faith, what can be answer for the sin of having that conscience?*

I grant where it is a sin to have such a conscience, the conscience doth not excuse the faults a man commits by it. But the Question we are upon is, whether it is not a sin for a man to have such a conscience; and we are not upon the point of an *Erroneous conscience*, but of an *Infallible Judg of conscience* in matters of good and evil. And it is strange the *Defender* should not see this. There is no question,
but

but there are as diffurable Points in Morality, as in matters of Faith; and we think Mens committing Sin, is at least as dangerous to their souls, as embracing what they call *Heresy*. Now I desire to know, why it is not as necessary to have an infallible Guide in Manners, as in Faith? But, if they think that Men may be let alone to judg as well as they can in such matters, as their Salvation certainly depends upon, what monstrous Inconvenience is it, if they use the same Liberty in matters of Speculation? I would he had given some better Answer, that I might have had an occasion to have inforced this matter. For in truth it seems to me, a very strange thing, when I read in the *New Testament*, such terrible Denunciations against the practice of Sin, and that mens happiness or misery depends so much on their doing Good or Evil; and so very little said as to mens errors or mistakes of Judgment (where there is a general Sincerity, as to a good Life, and a care to please God) that so much weight should be laid on an infallible Judg in matters of Controversy, and no care taken for an infallible Guide in matters of Practice.

But I am to consider, that it tends more to the interest of some People to swagger about an infallible Faith, than to secure the Practice of Virtue, and a good Life, which yet is certainly the great design and concernment of the Christian Religion, however it may seem to some, that an infallible Faith and Church are all in all.

To shew we do not allow every man to believe as he pleases, I said, We not only allow the Assistance of spiritual Guides, and embrace the ancient Creeds; but think no man ought to follow his own fancy, against Doctrines so universally received from the Apostles times.

But all this signifies nothing to him, unless our Guides be Infallible; and he saith, *They are plainly no Guides of Christs appointing, who teach any other Doctrine than he taught.* Very well! Let this then be the Rule, whereby we are to judg whether Guides are Infallible or not. But then have a care of telling us we must believe what Doctrine it was that Christ taught, upon the word of these Infallible Guides, for by that Doctrine we are to judg whether they be Infallible or not. The different methods of his Proceeding and mine in this matter, will be best understood by this Comparison. A Man that goes to enquire the way to a Place (he had a great desire to be at, but was afraid of mistaking the way) of two Men, and how he should avoid the dangerous passages in it; the one like a plain

Def. p. 29.

plain honest Man, tells him there are difficulties in it, but he will give him a *Book of the Roads*, which acquaints him with all the dangerous turnings: he bids him look well to his Steps, and observe the way he goes, and when he is to seek, to search his Book, and ask such as understand and the way better than he does: Alas! saith the other Man, this is a very sad Direction to him, for his Book may be misunderstood, and the Guides may mistake themselves with all their Care; but I will put him into an infallible way, whereby he may avoid all the dangers. Ay Sir, saith the Traveller, you speak indeed to the purpose, I pray acquaint me with it. There is, saith he to him, at such a Hill, a Person, who by the help of Wings, not only flies over all that dangerous passage, but carries all those safe, who take hold of him: You have therefore no better way than to pinion your self to him, and you will be safe. But saith the Traveller, how if he and I should tumble down together, what would become of us both? Never fear that, saith he: But how should I help fearing of it? Have any that he carried thither, come back and assured others of the safety of the passage? No. But how then? Why saith he, You are bound to believe what he saith, for he affirms that he can do it. But, saith the Traveller, this is very hard, I must venture Body and Soul upon his skill and strength, and I must take his Word that he hath both. This seems very unreasonable to me, and therefore I am resolved to take the other course, which tho it do not make such big boasts of it self, is much more likely to be safe in the conclusion, having better Reason on its side, and requiring a more constant care of my self, to which God hath promis'd more of his Grace and Assistance to secure me from all fatal mistakes of my way.

Where I mention *Doctrines so universally received in the Christian Church from the Apostles times, as those in the Creeds*; The Defender makes a notable Exception, *As if*, saith he, *any part of the universal Christian Doctrine were lost, and all had not been always as universally retained as the Creeds*. Then I hope all the Points in Controversy between us and them, can be proved by as clear and evident a Succession, as the Articles of the Creeds: If he can do this, he will be a *Champion* indeed. I desire him to take his choice, either *Supremacy, Transubstantiation, Infallibility of the Roman Catholick Church*, or which he pleases. I grant all true Christian Doctrine was universally retained, as far as the Rule of it was so received; but if he means any of those distinguishing points between us and them, when he comes to make it out, he will be of another mind.

(3.) A third Inconvenience objected in the Papers, against the want of an infallible Judg, was, *That Scripture would be interpreted by Fancy; which is the same thing as to follow Fancy.*

To this it was answer'd.

(1.) That our Church owns the Creeds, Councils, Fathers, and Primitive Church, more frankly than any other Church, and therefore cannot be suspected to leave Scripture to be so interpreted.

The Replier saith, *We only pretend it, and do it not.* That is to be proved, for bare saying it, will never convince us. But his proof is, *because, if we had done it, we had never deserted the Church of Rome;* and our Answer is, we therefore deserted the Communion of that Church, because She required owning things from us, for which She had no Authority, either from Scripture, Creeds, Councils or Fathers. Reply, p. 214

The Defender would have me answer directly, *Whether it be not the same to follow Fancy, as to interpret Scripture by it?* As tho I were examined at the Catechism, which requires all answers to be made by *Yea or Nay.* I said enough to shew the Question doth not concern us; for we do not allow Persons to interpret Scripture by Fancy. And withal. (2.) I asked some other Questions to shew, That those who pretend to Infallibility, may do things as unreasonable as leaving Scripture to be interpreted by Fancy. And I have our Saviours example for answering one question with another. Def. p. 30.

The Instances I gave, were these; The Church of *Romes* assuming to it self the Power of interpreting the Rule, which concerns its own Power of interpreting; which was to make it Judg in its own Cause, and to give it as great Power, as if it *made* the Rule; and I further added, that *Interest* is as mischievous an Interpreter of Scripture, as *Fancy*; and therefore, those who are so much concerned, are not to be relied on, either in Councils, or out.

The Power of declaring Tradition is as Arbitrary a thing in the Church of *Rome*, as interpreting Scripture by Fancy. There being no other Rule allowed by it, but the Sense of the present Church.

The Replier, like a fair Adversary, gives his answer plainly; Reply, p. 214
which consists in two things. (1.) *That their Church gives no Sense of Scripture, but what She received from Tradition of the foregoing Church, and so she calls it Apostolical Tradition.* But suppose there happen a Question, whether it be so or not, must not all be resolved into the Authority of the present Church, declaring what is Apostolical Tradition? And so it comes all to one.

(2.) He faith, *Tradition is publick, and Fancy is private.* But I say, according to their Rules, *Tradition* is but *publick Fancy*, and so *Fancy* in particular Persons is a *private Tradition*; but whether publick or private, if it be equally Arbitrary, the Case is alike.

Def. p. 31.

The Defender faith, *All this is besides the Business*, and therefore slides off as well as he can, with some slight touches, which deserve no Answer.

(4.) *If there be no infallible Judg, the Power of deciding matters of Faith will be given to every particular man, for which no place can be shew'd.*

The Answer was, That if by deciding matters of Faith, no more be meant, but every mans being satisfied of the Reasons, why he believes one thing to be true, and not another; that belongs to every man as he is bound to take care of his Soul, and must give an account both to God and Man, of the Reason of his Faith.

Reply, p. 22.

This, the Replier faith, is bringing every Article of Faith to the Test of ones own Reason; whereas Authority is the Correlative of Believing, and Reason of Knowledge.

We do not pretend that every one that believes, should be able to judg from meer Principles of Reason of the Credibility of the Doctrine propos'd; it is sufficient, if he finds it to be of Divine Revelation, by being contained in Gods word. And it is not the Authority of the Church, but of Divine Revelation, which Faith bottoms upon; the former is no more than an inducement to believe those Books we call Scripture, to contain the word of God in them. But when we find any Doctrine therein, we account that sufficient Reason for believing it.

Def. p. 32.

The Defender finds no fault with our saying, *We ought to be satisfied of the Reason why we believe*; but the Question he puts, is, *Whether there be indeed any Reasons why they should believe besides the Authority of the Church?* He doth not deny that particular Men ought to judg; but the meaning of the Papers, he faith, is, *that they ought not to judg unreasonably.*

Then we have no difference, for I assure him I never pleaded for mens judging unreasonably. The Question then between us, is, *Whether those who do not believe upon the Infallible Authority of the Roman Catholick Church, Do judg unreasonably? i.e. Whether there be equal Grounds to believe the Roman Catholick Church Infallible, as there are to believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God?* We utterly deny the Roman Churches Infallibility

fallibility to be necessary to our believing the Scripture ; for we receive that by an *Universal Tradition* from all the Apostolical Churches ; which is as clear for this, as it is wanting for the other. And therefore we must judg more reasonably. What follows about the Infallibility promised to the Church, hath been answered already.

As to the *Canonical Books*, I shewed it was no *Authoritative Decision* by a Power in the Church to make Books *Canonical* which were not so, but a meer giving *Testimony* in a *Matter of Fact*, in which all parts of the Church are concerned ; and it depends as other Matters of Fact do, on the Skill and Fidelity of the Reporters : And so far I own the truly *Catholick Church* to have Authority in any Testimony, delivering down the Books of Scripture ; but this proves no more *Infallibility* in the Christian Church as to the Books of the *New Testament*, than it doth in the *Jewish Church* as to the Books of the *Old Testament*.

And thus much of the *Authority* of the *Catholick Church* in Matters of Faith.

III. Of the Reformation of the Church of England.

There are so many Passages in the Papers relating to the Church of *England*, on the Account of her Reformation, that I thought it the best Method of proceeding to handle this Subject by it self. And there are these things charged upon it, either in Terms or by Consequence, in the Papers, which as I am a Member of this Church, I think my self bound to clear ; for I could nor justifie continuing in her Communion, if she were justly liable to these Imputations.

1. That she hath made a causeless Breach in the Communion of the *Catholick Church*.

2. That she hath been the occasion of a World of Heresies crept into this Nation.

3. That she hath not sufficient Authority within her self, and yet denies an Appeal to a higher Judicature.

4. That she contradicts her own Rule, *viz.* the Holy Scriptures.

A Vindication of the Answer

5. That she subsists only on the Pleasure of the Civil Magistrate.

All these I shall examine with Care, and consider what hath been said in Defence of the Papers upon these Heads.

As to the charge of causeless Breach in the Communion of the Catholick Church, it lies in these Words, *And by what Authority Men separate themselves from that Church?*

Which being spoken with respect to the Members of the Church of *England*, do imply that they have made a Separation from the Communion of the Catholick Church, and that they had no sufficient Authority for so doing, and therefore are guilty of Schism in it.

To the Question two Answers were given, 1. By distinguishing the truly Catholick Church from the *Roman-Catholick*: And a Distinction between these being made out, (which is done in the first part of this Defence) It doth not follow that we have made a Breach in the Communion of the Catholick Church, because we do not join in Communion with the *Roman-Catholick*: This was illustrated by the Example of a prosperous Usurper in a Kingdom, who challenges a Title to the whole, by gaining a considerable part of it, and requires from all the Kings Subjects within his Power, to own him to be rightful King; whereupon the Question was put, Whether refusing to do it, were an Act of Rebellion or of Loyalty? So in the Church, the Popes Authority over it, so as to restrain Catholick Communion only to those who own it, is not only looked on as an Usurpation by Us, but by all the *Eastern-Churches*; and is in Truth altering the *Terms* of Christian Communion from what they were in the truly Catholick and Apostolick Church: Therefore since the Conditions required are unreasonable, because different from them, what Breach hath followed, is not to be imputed to those who refuse these Terms, but to those who impose them; and so the Guilt of it lies upon the Church of *Rome*, and not upon the Church of *England*. This is the Substance of the Answer.

Reply, p. 25.

To which the Replier saith, *That the Eastern Churches cannot be parts of the Catholick Church, because they hold not the Apostolick Doctrine contained in the Creeds and Councils owned by the Church of England.* This hath been fully answered already. But he goes on, *There were no other Churches then in being, but those which were in Communion with the Church of Rome; consequently the Church of England*

England going out from them, separated her self from the Catholick Apostolick Church.

And the Defender saith, He expects I should shew That truly Catholick and Apostolick Church we held Communion with, when we separated from the Roman. He desires to know where the men live, that people may go to them, and learn of them, what their Faith is, &c. Def. p. 39.

In answer to this, I say, That there is no necessity for us to shew any Church distinct from others, which in all things we agreed with; because we hold all particular Churches liable to Errors and Corruptions; and that the notion of the Catholick Church may take in such Particulars from which we may see reason to dissent: But we do not thereby exclude them from being parts of the Catholick Church; but we say they are no Infallible Rule to us, and therefore we ought to proceed by what the Church hath receiv'd as an Infallible Rule, and not by the Communion of other Churches. And supposing there were no particular Church we did in all things joyn with, the Church of *England* might Reform it self without separating from the Catholick Apostolick Church. For it was then in the Case, particular Churches were in after the Councils of *Ariminum* and *Seleucia*; for then the standard of Catholick Communion, set up by the Council of *Nice*, was taken down; and the setting of it up again, was to oppose the Consent of the Christian Church in the most General Council that ever Assembled. I do not say, this Council obliged men to profess *Arrianism*; but that it took away the Authority of the *Nicene Creed* in as valid a manner as the Council by its Acts could do it; I ask then, by what Authority any particular Church could set up the *Nicene Faith*; and if not, how it was possible to be restored? And I desire to know in what Country the people lived, who then owned the *Nicene Faith* against such a General Council? And where were the Churches in being, which at that time adhered to it? But if in this Case the *British Church*, tho alone, was bound notwithstanding such a general consent, to Reform it self, and to restore the Authority of the *Nicene Creed*; the same Case it is, when the Western Church was oppressed and hindered from Reforming Errors and Abuses by the Usurpation and Tyranny of the Papal Faction; the Church of *England* was then obliged to exercise its own Inherent Right, in bringing things to the state they were in, in the time of the first General Councils. In matters of Reformation, the main enquiries are, whether there be just Occasion, and

and due Authority for it, and a certain Rule to proceed by; the last and least important Question is, what Company we have to joyn with us in it? For there is a Natural Right in every Church to preserve its own just Liberties, and consequently to throw off such an Usurpation as that of the Popes was. And the main Point in order to a Reformation, was casting off the Popes Power, as an encroachment upon the Ancient and Canonical Priviledges of the Western Churches, which was done here by a General consent even of those Bishops, who held in Communion with the *Roman Church*, as far as those could do who rejected the Head of it. And this is the Fundamental Point as to the matter of Schism: If the Pope, as Head of the Church, doth influence Catholick Communion so far, that it is necessary to Salvation to live in subjection to him, it will be very hard to justify separation from that Body whereof he is the visible Head. But if there be no Scripture, no Councils, no Universal Tradition for this, as the *Roman Catholick Bishops* here declared in the time of *H. 8.* then there can be no Schism in acting without Authority from him, or against his Authority. And whether any other Church joyned with ours or not, is no more material to the justification of the Reformation, than the lawfulness of any one Countie Acting for the Royal Family in the late times of Usurpation, did depend upon the concurrence of others with it. What more commonly talked of, and magnified in the Church of *Rome*, than the Reformation of the *Monastick Orders*? And some of the persons have been Canonized who have done it; But in this Case, the Governour of a Monastick Order, proceeding according to the Rules of his Order, doth a very justifiable thing, tho never another Monastery joyn with him in it; because he only doth his duty, and proceeds by the Rules which are receiv'd by the whole Order. This, I say, was the Case of the Church of *England* in Reforming according to Scripture, and the sense of the Primitive Church; and if others joyned, so much the better; if not, the Act justifies it self, and needs not the concurrence of others to make it good.

(2.) The 2^d Answer was, That there is a difference between voluntary Separation, and that which is unavoidable, in case unreasonable conditions of Communion be required.

The Defender pretends He can by no means understand this unavoidable Separation; because tho Men be separated from the Communion of a Church, yet they may continue of the same Faith if they please:
but

but if they have another Faith, they separate themselves, even supposing Usurpation, or whatever I would have.

Now this seems very strange to me from a person who knows the Terms of Communion with the *Roman Church*. Can any Man be a true Member thereof, who doth not own and profess to believe the Popes Supremacy, Transubstantiation, &c. Is he not by the constitution of that Church required to believe all that the *Roman Church* believes? But suppose men do not, and cannot for their hearts believe as that Church believes; can they notwithstanding be Members of it? No, he confesses a *different Faith unavoidably casts them out*. But then to believe otherwise than the *Roman Church* believes, casts them out unavoidably. The Question now is, who is the cause of this casting out, those who cannot believe those Doctrines, or those who require the belief of them in order to communion? If these Doctrines be evident in Scripture, or were defined by the four General Councils, or are contained in the ancient Creeds, or can be clearly proved by Universal Tradition, then we confess the blame falls on those who refuse; but if none of those can be made appear to the satisfaction of a mans mind who desires to search out Truth, then their separation is unavoidable, and there is no reason to make it their voluntary act. But, saith the Defender, *a mans faith is his own voluntary act*. I grant that; but not a voluntary cause of Separation: which two ought to be distinguished in this case. As in the case of Usurpation, the owning the lawful King is a voluntary act; but if an Usurper threatens to banish him if he doth not abjure him; upon whom must the blame be laid, upon the mans voluntary act, or the Usurpers voluntary imposing such a penalty on those who do nothing but what is just? The Defender did not consider that the making such terms of communion was a voluntary act too, and being a thing unreasonable and unjust, it leaves the blame upon the imposers.

Def: p: 40:

But he denies any such thing as Usurpation in the Pope, because he hath shewed by his reiterated Approbation of the Bishop of Meaux's Book, that he is content with that submission and obedience, which the Holy Councils and Fathers have always taught the Faithful.

These are very fine words to deceive the unwary. But I pray tell us, who is to declare *what the Councils and Fathers have always taught the Faithful*? Who is to be Judge? Is not the Pope himself? For no Council will be allowed without his Approbation and Confirmation. And is not this then a very pretty Artifice to draw

draw weak persons into a snare ? For my part, I do not wonder at the *Popes Approbation of the Bishop of Meaux's Book*, no more than I would at a Gentlemans approbation of a fine spun Net when he goes a fishing, which is not so easily discerned, and yet doth as effectually catch the Game: Some there are still who love to be deceived, and some have more arts of deceiving than others ; and those who gain most by it, will be sure to give them the greatest approbation.

Pag. 41.

The Defender proceeds : *Suppose there were Usurpation, must people therefore believe otherwise than they did before ; as that there is no change of Substance, no Purgatory, no more than two Sacraments, and the rest ?*

The Question about Faith is one thing, and about Separation is another. We are now upon the latter of these ; and in this case we are most concerned about the Popes Authority, since he is look'd on by you as the Head of the Catholick Church, and the Center of Communion. If there were no such Usurpation, yet we should never decline giving an account of the Reasons of our Faith, as to Sacraments, Purgatory, or what you please of the Points in difference between us. Which I neither desire to make greater or lesser, than really they are. For there may be deceit both ways.

Def. p. 42.

As to his renewing the Question, *by what authority we separate ?* I answer, by the same authority which makes it unlawful for us to profess what we do not believe ; and to practise what we believe God hath forbidden: This is just as if one should ask by what authority men are bound to be honest and sincere ; and to prefer Gods Laws before mens ? For the Church of Rome requires from the Members of her Communion, besides matters of Faith, such acts of Worship, which, whatever they be, to those who believe as they do, must be *Idolatrous* to those that believe as we do. For example, suppose in *China* where they believe God to be the same with the *World*, that honour of the *Chineses* (who on that account think they may lawfully give Divine Worship to any part of the *World*) to be converted by the *Missionaries*, who tell them the parts of the *World* cannot be God, for he is Infinite and Immutable, and Wise, and Powerful, which the Parts of the *World* are not, and cannot be, and therefore they cannot without Idolatry give Divine Worship to them ; the *Mandarins* require their giving the same *Adorations* that others do ; they refuse and say, Whatever you may do, who believe God and the *World* to be the same, certainly it would

would be gross Idolatry in us, who believe the thing you worship, to be nothing but dull insensible parts of the World. And if now it should be asked, By what authority they separate? Is there not a plain answer, By the authority of God himself, who requires Adoration to be given to himself alone?

But *who shall be Judg*, saith the Defender? God himself will be Pag. 43.
Judg as the great Day, whether we will or not. And I think that is more to be regarded, than putting an end to Controversies. If we be not sincere and faithful to him and his service, if we do not act and judg with a regard to the Judgment of that day, all the pretences in the world of a Judg in Controversies, then will stand in no stead. If we do use our careful endeavours to know the will of God, and to do it, we have great reason to hope God will shew mercy to us; and then the Question will not appear of such wonderful importance, *Who shall be Judg here?*

But we do not decline a reasonable Judgment in this world; we only desire our Judges may be fair and equal, and such as God hath appointed. And if those who would judg for us, pretend that they have a Divine Commission, we desire to know who shall be judg of this pretence? We have no reason to trust them; and they will not trust us. So that here we are stop't at first, unless the Commission be produced, which impowers those persons to judg, who challenge such authority over our judgments. A general indefinite obscure Commission, which may extend to all other Guides in the Church as well as to them, will by no means be sufficient. Let us see whom Christ hath appointed in his own words, and we will submit; for we look on him as Supreme Judg and Legislator to his Church; and if he hath thought fit to appoint an infallible Judg, we have done. But we desire to know where he hath done it? Hath he granted any new Commission from Heaven? No. Is it to be found in Scripture? Yes. But then I pray observe, you tell us Scripture cannot be Judg in any Controversie, being ambiguous, uncertain, general, mute, flexible, and what not? and because it cannot hear Parties, nor give a decisive voice, it can by no means be a Judg of Controversies. How then can the Scripture put an end to this Controversie, when it can put an end to none? Are the Expressions in this matter so particular, so clear, so peremptory, that we cannot mistake about the sense of them? If so, then I perceive, notwithstanding all the hard words given it, Scripture may be Judg as well as a Rule, because it is fitted to put an end to such

a Controversie, which is as doubtful as any ; and why not as well to all the rest ? We are not then afraid of this Question, *Who shall be Judge ?* But we desire to be satisfied about it ; and to know not only who hath appointed him, but who he is, whether the Pope in *Cathedra*, or a General Council ? For this is very material for us to know, since even at this day you are far from being agreed about it. The Assembly of the Clergy of France have solemnly declared within few years, *That they do not believe the Popes Judgment to be Infallible.* The Clergy of Hungary have rejected and censured this Declaration as *absurd and detestable, and have forbidden any to read, hold or teach the Doctrine, and own the Pope to be the only Infallible Judge of Controversies.* A Sorbon Doctor in his Notes on the Hungarian Censure, calls this, *the new Heresie of the Jesuits ;* on the other side, large Volumes have been Printed to prove, *that the right of judging infallibly, belongs only to the Pope.*

And now very lately comes out a Learned Book by another Doctor of the Sorbon, to prove *not only that the Popes Judgment is not Infallible, but that it is a dangerous thing to believe it ; and that no man ought to do it, unless infallible proof be brought of it.* But he proves at large, that not so much as probable evidence can be brought for it, either from *Scripture or Tradition.*

I pray now the Defender to tell me, *Who is the Judge ? Is the Pope Infallible or not ? It is easily answer'd I, or no.* And it is necessary to be answer'd, if we must know, *Who is the Judge ?*

The common Evasion is, *That you are agreed, that Popes and Councils together are ;* but this is but an Evasion. For the Infallibility is by virtue of Divine Promises, and those must either relate to the Church as the subject of them ; or to the Successors of St. Peter in their capacity as such. If to the former, the Popes have nothing to do in it, but as included in the Church ; if the latter, the Councils have no Infallibility, but the Pope. To say *the Council is infallible, when confirmed by the Pope,* is Nonsense. For, either it was Infallible in its Decree, or not. If not, it can borrow no Infallibility from the Popes subsequent Confirmation ; but the Popes Judgment may be said to be Infallible, but by no means the Councils. And *Du Pin* hath proved, that there cannot be two Seats of Infallibility ; for whereever there is Infallibility, it can receive no addition or force from another Infallibility ; and whatever is Infallible, must be believed for it self, and not depend on anothers Judgment. And therefore I again desire the Defender to make no harangues about this

Cler. Gallica.
Declaratio
Prop. 4. 1682.
Censura Hun-
garica. 24 Oct.
1682.

Tractat. de
Libertat. Ec-
cles. Gallican.
Leodii, 1684.
Regale Sacer-
dorum Roma-
no Pontifici
assertum.
Auctore Eu-
genio Lom-
bardo, 1684.
De Antiqua
Ecclesiæ Dis-
ciplina Dissert.
5. Auct. Lud.
Ellies Du Pin,
1686.

Dissert. 5. c. 1.
ff. 2.

this matter, but to answer directly, *Who is the Judge?* For we would fain be acquainted with this some body, as he speaks; but I am afraid his some body of Infallibility, will prove a more pleasing dream than what he charges me with in what follows. Pag. 44.

I had given a fair account of the proceedings in England upon the Reformation, how the search began, the Popes Authority to be discarded, and the Articles of Religion to be drawn up, which ought not to be looked on as particular Fancies, but the sense of our Church.

All this he calls a *pleasing dream*; I am sure the pretence of Infallibility is so; but I related matter of fact, which he hath no mind to meddle with, but he runs again to his, *Who shall be Judge?* And concludes, *that I think between Churches there's none at all.* I do think the Church of England in this divided state of the Catholick Church, is under no Superior Judicature, but that it hath sufficient power and authority to reform abuses, and to declare Articles of Religion so as to oblige its Members to Conformity; especially since it proceeds by such excellent Rules, as the *Holy Scriptures*, the ancient Councils, and Universal Tradition. And I hope this may pass for a direct Answer. Pag. 45.

The Replier takes another course besides this, for he makes use of these two Topicks against the Church of England: 1. *That the Church of Rome was in possession of all those Truths we rejected* 2. *That we ought to bring positive Texts for our Negative Articles.* Reply. p. 25
Pag. 27.

1. As to the Plea of Possession of all those Truths now question'd by us. This were a pleasant thing for us to question them, if we owned they were Truths; but he means only that he thinks them so. Well then, how is it their Church was in possession of those Truths? Do they become Truths by their possession, or only that they were Truths they were then possessed of? If so, he must first prove them to be Truths, or the Possession signifies nothing. And that is the point I went upon, that no Possession gives a right to Truth; but the Church of England had just reason to examine whether these were Truths or not; and upon examination finding them to be otherwise, it had reason to reject them.

But to enforce this, he saith afterwards, *That their Church had a thousand years prescription here, and that their Religion came into this Nation with Christianity.* Reply, p. 40.

Although according to St. Cyprian's Rule, all this proves no more than the Antiquity of Error, unless the proof be made from Scripture,

A Vindication of the Answer

ture, yet because this goes a great way with some people, I do not only deny the truth of it, but shall give evident proof to the contrary.

For I suppose it will not be questioned, that the Religion brought in here by *Augustin* and his Companions, was the Religion of *Gregory the Great*; I shall therefore compare the Doctrine of the Council of *Trent* with that of *Gregory*, in some remarkable Particulars, and shew the great Difference between them as to these things.

I. Scripture and Tradition.

Council of Trent,

Gregory the Great,

DEclares, That it receives Traditions with an equal Veneration with Holy Scriptures, Sess. 4.

Affirms, That all things which edifie and instruct, are contained in the Volume of Scriptures, in *Ezek. Hom. l. 1. cap. 8.*

That Gods Mind is to be found in his Words, *Regul. Epist. l. 4. Ep. 40.*

That the Scripture is the Glass of the Elect, in *Reg. l. 4. c. 10.* in *Job l. 2. c. 1.*

That to be born of God, is to love his Will revealed in Scripture, in *1 Reg. c. 14.*

That Preachers are to instruct their People in what they learn, out of the Holy Scriptures, *Greg. Sacram. in Consecr. Episcopi.*

That the Staves being in the Rings on the sides of the Ark, do shew that Teachers should have the holy Scriptures in their hearts, that from thence they may presently teach whatever is needful, *de Cura Pastor, l. 2. c. 11.*

2. Apochryphal Books.

The Council of Trent,

Gregory the Great,

REckons the Maccabees among the Canonical Books, Sess. 4.

PLainly rejects them from being Canonical; for he excuses taking an Example out of them, not being Canonical, Moral. in Job, l. 19. c. 13.

3. Merit of Good Works.

The Council of Trent,

Gregory the Great,

ANathematizes those who deny good Works to be truly meritorious of Grace and Eternal Life, Sess. 6. Can. 32.

DEnies the most sanctified Persons to procure Divine Wisdom by their Graces, in Job l. 18. c. 26.

Affirms, that the best Men will find no Merit in their best Actions, Moral. l. 9. c. 2.

That all human Righteousness will be found unrighteousness, if strictly judged, Ib. l. 9. c. 11.

That if he should attain to the highest Virtue, he should obtain eternal Life, not by Merits, but by Pardon, Ib.

4. Auricular Confession.

The Council of Trent,

Gregory the Great,

DEclares secret Confession of all sins to be necessary in order to Remission and Absolution by the Priest, Sess. 14. c. 6, 7, 8.

SPeaks of no other Confession than what was required in order to the Reconciliation of those who had undergone publick Penance, the Custom whereof at Rome, is set down in Gelasius his

Sa.

A Vindication of the Answer

The Council of Trent,

Gregory the Great.

Sacramentary, p. 63. And Gregory refers to the Custom then used, in his *Sacramentary*, p. 225. And there is no Form of *Absolution* in either of them, but by way of Prayer to God, which is different from a *Sacramental*, *judicial Absolution*, required by the Council of Trent.

He makes no *Absolution* true, but that which follows the judgment of God, which he parallels with the loosing of Lazarus after Christ had raised him from the Grave, Horn. 26. in Evangel.

5. Solitary Masses.

The Council of Trent,

Gregory the Great,

A Nathematizes those who say such Masses wherein the Priest only communicates, are unlawful, and to be abrogated, Sess. 22. Can. 8.

FOrbids the Priest to celebrate alone, and saith expressly it ought not to be celebrated by one, because the People are to bear their share, Greg lib. Capital. c. 7. apud Cassandr. Liturg. c. 33.

Transubstantiation.

The Council of Trent,

Gregory the Great,

DEclares the Body of Christ to be in the Eucharist under the Species of Bread, Sess. 13. Cap. 1.

ASserts the Body of Christ after his Resurrection to be palpable, i. e. That it may be seen and felt where it is, and that he proved this against Eutychius of Constantinople, Moral. l. 14. c. 31.

He

Council of Trent,

Gregory the Great,

That asserts only the Species to remain after Consecration, ib. c. 4.

He frequently declares, That our Bodies as well as our Souls, are nourished by the Eucharist, which cannot be done by more species; for no Accidents can produce a Substance, Greg. Sacram. 16. Kal. Mart. in Sexages. Hebd. 3. in Quadrag. Fr. 4.

7. Communion in one Kind.

Council of Trent,

Gregory the Great,

DEclares against the necessity of Communion in both kinds, Seff. 13. Cap 13.

Affirms it to be the constant practise for the People to receive in both.

Sacram. in Quadrag. Fr. 3.

6 Kal. Julii ad Complend.

Hebd. 3. in Quadr. Sabbato.

Miss Temp. Belli.

Sexages. ad Complend.

Domin. in Ramis Palm.

VI. Non. Julii ad Complend.

VIII. Kal. Aug. ad Compl.

Kalend. Aug. ad Compl.

The like may be observed in Gelasius his Sacramentary, who declared it Sacriledg to do otherwise; as appears by the known Canon, Comperimus. De Consecr. Dist. 2. who was one of Gregory's Predecessors, and not long before him.

A Vindication of the Answer

8. Purgatory.

Council of Trent,

Gregory the Great,

DEclares that there is a Purgatory after this Life, out of which Souls may be helped by the Prayers of the faithful, Sess. 25.

Affirms, That at the time of Death, either the good or evil Spirit seizeth upon the Soul, and keeps it with it for ever without any change. Moral in Job, l. 8. c. 8. ed. Basil. c. 9. ed. Novæ. That, in the day of death, the just goes to Joy, and the wicked with the Apostate Angel is reprobated. Moral. in Job, l. 12. c. 4.

The Passages in his Dialogues, which seem to contradict these, do not come up to the Council of Trents Purgatory; for they only speak of a Purgation for light and venial sins, and not for the temporal pain of mortal sins, * whose Guilt is remitted: But in the former places he plainly denies any change of State after this Life; so that the Purgation he speaks of, must be consistent with a State of Joy; and in that very place, he saith, Persons shall be at the day of Judgment, as they were when they went out of the World.

* Dial. 4. c. 39.

9. Masses for the Dead.

The Council of Trent,

Gregory the Great,

DEclares, That they are intended for those who are dead in Christ, not yet fully purged from their sins. Sess. 22. c. 2.

Supposes those to be in a State of Bliss, for whom the Oblation was made at the Altar, as appears

The Council of Trent,

Gregory the Great.

appears by the Sacramentary IV. Kalend. Julii, where the Oblation is first mention'd; and after follows, *Deus qui animæ famuli tui Leonis eternæ beatitudinis præmiâ contulisti.*

10. Worship of Images.

The Council of Trent,

Gregory the Great,

DEclares, not only that Images are to be placed in Temples, but to be worshipped there. Sess. 25.

Allows their being in Temples, but denies any worship to be given to them. For he not only often denies any Adoration to be given them; but he saith, *They are only for Instruction; which excludes Relative Worship.* Registr. Epist. 1. 9. Ep. 9. l. 7. Ep. 110.

The Epistle to Secundinus Guffanvillæus in his late Edition of S. Gregory, saith, was not to be found in the most Ancient MSS.

11. Extreme Unction.

The Council of Trent,

Gregory the Great,

Anathematizes those who do affirm it not to be a true and proper Sacrament, appointed by Christ for Remission of Sins, and conferring Grace. Sess. 14. Can. 1, 2.

Mentions the Unction then used in order to the Recovery of sick Persons; and in the Prayer applies S. James his Words that way; and then adds, *Sana quoque quæsumus, omnium medicator ejus Febrim, & cunctorum languorum cruciatus ægritudinemq;*, &c. Sacram. p. 253. And immediately before, in the Unction,

A Vindication of the Answer Council of Trent.

Gregory the Great,

Unction, these words are said,
*Per hanc sacraei olei Unctionem—
pristinam & emmelioratem recipie
mersaris sanitatem. Ibid.*

And that it was not looked on
as the last Sacrament, appears
by things in that Sacramentary:

1. *The Eucharist was to be given
after it:*

2. *It was to^d be continued for
seven days if there were occa-
sion; & suscitabit eum Deus;*
which shews that it was designed
for bodily health.

12. Pope's Supremacy.

Council of Trent,

Gregory the Great,

OWned it from beginning to
end; and refer'd the Con-
firmation of its Decrees to the
Pope, as *Supreme Head of the
Church.*

DEclares the *Headship* of the
Church to be peculiar to
Christ. Registr. Ep. l. 4. Ep. 36,
38. where he speaks not of an
Essential Head, but of the *Foun-
tain of Jurisdiction.*

He urges it as an inconve-
nience, If there were a *Head* of
the Church, the Church must err
with him. Epist. 32. 36.

Which *Bellarmin* owns to be a
true Consequence. *De R. Pot.*
l. 4. c. 5.

He makes it the *Pride* of Lu-
cifer, and the *forerunning* of An-
tichrist, for one Bishop to set him-
self above the rest. Ep. 36.

Not to be the *Sole Bishop*; but
to have all the rest in *subjection* to
him.

These

These things may be sufficient at present, to shew how little ground there is to say, That the Religion now owned in the Church of *Rome*, was brought in hither with Christianity in the time of *Gregory the Great*.

(2.) The Replier saith, *We ought to bring positive Texts for our negative Articles; as no Praying to Saints, no Purgatory, no Worship of Images, no Transubstantiation, and the like; with which, he saith, the 39 Articles are stult.* But why must we be obliged to bring Texts for the Negative? Because he saith, *we make these Articles of Faith.* Repl. p. 27.

To answer this, Let us suppose the Common Council of the City should agree to make men swear that the Monument near *London Bridge*, is a living creature, and should exclude all those from the City Priviledges who do not; and that others having examin'd the Monument, and found nothing but Stones and Iron, were resolv'd to follow their Senses, and declare their minds, That upon due consideration, they did judg the Monument to be no living creature; Would any say, these men made it an Article of their Faith, when they only rejected a false proposition impos'd upon the Faith of others? Why may not a Church declare what it doth not believe, as well as what it doth? And when it declares what it doth not believe, doth it make such declarations Articles of Faith? The plain case is, Those of the Church of *Rome* impose things we think as hard and unreasonable as the former Example: Our Church not only denies its belief of them; but signifies it to its Members by a body of Articles which they are to sign, to testify their consent: How doth this come to make every one of these Declarations an Article of Faith? They are only Articles of Agreement, and not of Faith. And the difference between these may be easily understood. *An Article of Faith* supposes a *Divine Revelation*, as the Replier yields; but if men offer that for a Divine Revelation, which is not, the rejecting of that cannot be called an Article of Faith; because there is no need of Revelation to declare the other to be none, supposing there be a Rule to judg what is of Divine Revelation, and what not. That Rule we say is the *Holy Scripture*, not interpreted by Fancy, but by the Primitive Church; by this Rule so interpreted, we reject *Invocation of Saints, Purgatory, Worship of Images, Transubstantiation, &c.* And why then should our rejecting them, be called so many Articles of Faith? We own the Scripture for our Rule, and for our compleat and adequate Rule of Faith; and therefore it serves us both for what we

A Vindication of the Answer

are to believe, and what we are not to believe. In positive Articles, we resolve our Faith into Divine Revelation contained in Scripture; in Negative, the Article of Faith is, *That Scripture is our Rule*; but from thence it is a necessary Consequence of Reason, That we are not to believe any thing but what is contained in Scripture; or may be deduced from thence. Which deductions being within the force of the Rule, are not to be looked on as different from it; and what can neither be proved by Scripture, nor by deductions from it, if our Principle be allowed, we can never be blamed if we reject it. For otherwise we should not act reasonably, nor agreeable to our own Principles.

But as to the Particulars mentioned, we do not merely reject them as not contained in Scripture, but as repugnant to such Principles concerning Divine Worship, Remission of Sins, the Nature of Christs Body, &c. which are evidently contained therein: But I go no further than the Replier leads me.

At the Conclusion of the first Paper, there was a suggestion, *As tho the Schism were raised by particular men, for their own Advantage.*

It was answered, That the Advantage of the Clergy lay plainly on the other side; which is yielded by the Replier; and yet he would have *the Clergy byast*: What, byast against their Interest? For that is the point, Whether they got or lost by the Reformation? and besides other considerations, if there were so much *Sacrilege* committed by it, as is said in one of the Papers, it is hard to suppose that they should raise the Schism for their own Advantage. I am, of the Defenders mind, *That matter of Interest ought not to be regarded in these things*; but when that was said to lie at the bottom of the Reformation, we had reason to consider on which side lay the greater Advantage.

Reply, p. 28.

Def. p. 46.

The 2d Charge is, *That the Reformation hath been the occasion of a World of Heresies creeping into this Nation.* With this the 2d Paper begins.

In answer it was said, That either this respects the several Sects of Dissenters from the Religion established by Law, and then it seems hard, considering all circumstances, to charge the Church of England with them; or it takes in all that dissent from the Church of Rome, and so it is a charge on the whole Church since the Reformation, as guilty of *Heretic*; which was a charge I said could never be made good.

The Defender avoids the charge as to the Church of England; but the Replier in plain terms owns it; saying, *That establishment*
of

of a Religion by Law, cannot protect it from being a Heresie; which I readily grant. And then he adds, *Let him defend his own, and his work is done.* The best way to do that, is to consider first what Heresie is, and that I said was an obstinate opposing some necessary Article of Faith; and then, how it comes to be in the Power of the Church of Rome to define Heretical Doctrines, so as that any Doctrine comes to be Heresie, by being contrary to its Definitions?

He answers, *By the same way the Church had Power in her General Councils, to make Creeds, and to Anathematize Hereticks.*

So that whatever Power the Catholick Church exercised in declaring Matters of Faith, he challenges as of Right belonging to the Church of Rome, which wholly depends on the first Point already discussed; viz. That the Roman and Catholick Church are the same

But I shall now wave that, and consider, Whether if that were allow'd, the Church could now have the same Reason to declare the Points in difference to be Heresies, as the Primitive Church had the Doctrines of the Trinity, and Incarnation of Christ.

I am of opinion it cannot; and yet if it could, that alone is not sufficient to charge Heresie upon us.

And in making out of both these, I shall argue from the Nature of Heresie, as it is stated among their best Writers, who agree that there are three Things necessary to make up the charge of Heresie. 1. The Nature of the Proposition. 2. The Authority of the Proponent. 3. The obstinacy of the Party.

1. The Nature of the Proposition; for it is allowed among them, that there is a difference between a Proposition Erroneous in Faith, and Heretical.

But for our better understanding this matter, I shall set down something very pertinently observed by Aquinas and others.

1. Aquinas saith, *That Faith in us depends upon Divine Revelation, not such as is made to any person, but that which was made to the Prophets and Apostles, which is preserved in the Canonical Books; and therefore he saith, the proofs from Scripture are necessary and convincing; those from other Authorities are but probable:* Which is a Testimony of great Consequence in this matter; for from hence it appears, that whatsoever Article of Faith is made necessary to be believed, must be proved from Scripture; and Heresie being an obstinate opposing a necessary Article of Faith, there can be no Heresie, where the Doctrine is not founded on Scripture: And elsewhere he makes the principles of Faith to be the Authorities of the Scripture.

Inititur enim
Fides nostra
Revelationi
Apostolis &
Prophetis facta
qui Canonicos libros
scripserunt,
non autem revelationi
si qua fuit aliis
Doctoribus facta. 1. q. 1.
Ar. 8. ad 2.
2. 2. q. 1
Ar. 5. ad 2.

2. That

2. That all matters of Faith are not equally revealed in Scripture ; For some, he saith, are principally designed, as the Trinity and Incarnation ; and these are directly against Faith ; and to hold the contrary to them, especially with obstinacy, is Heresie ; but there are others which are indirectly against Faith ; from whence something follows which overthrows Faith ; as, for any one to deny that Samuel was the son of Helcanah, the consequence would be, that the Scripture was false.

3. He makes a distinction between those who discern the Repugnancy, and continue obstinate, and those who do not ; not intending to maintain any thing contrary to Faith ; and in this case there may be an erroneous opinion in Faith, without Heresie. So that an erroneous opinion lies in not attending to the Consequence of that Opinion, as against Faith, and not maintaining it obstinately. But he asserts it to be in the Churches Power to declare such an opinion to be against Faith, and then he makes it Heretical to deny it : His Instance is about the five Notions of the Trinity ; and his Conclusion is, That it cannot be Heretical in it self to have different Opinions about them , but it is very hard to understand how the Church by its declaration can make the holding one or the other opinion to be more or less repugnant to Faith. But then the Reason of Heresie must be resolved into the Authority of the Church ; of which afterwards ; yet still Scripture is the Rule by which the Church is to judg.

(4) That there are some things revealed in Scripture which immediately tend to make mankind happy ; and those are the Articles of Faith which all men are bound to believe explicitly ; other things are revealed by accident, or secondarily, as that Abraham had two Sons, that David was the Son of Jesse. Now as to these latter points he saith, That it is enough to have an inward preparation of mind to believe all that is contained in Scripture ; and those things in particular as soon as they are known to be there. But we believe all persons bound to search the Scriptures, that they may know what is contained therein. However we gain this point hereby, that by their own Doctrine, besides the Articles of Faith receiv'd on both sides, no other points can become necessary, till they be made appear to us to be contained in Scripture, otherwise it is sufficient for us to be ready to believe whatever is contained therein. And consequently, we cannot be charged with Heresie for rejecting them.

De Hæret: pū-
nit. l. 1. c. 3:

Alphonſus a Castro makes this distinction between Heresie and a Proposition erroneous in Faith ; That the former is against such a point of Faith, as all men are bound to believe ; but there are some Propositions, he saith, relating to Faith, wherein a man is under no obligation

tion to believe either part of the contradiction. But if he asserts either of them to be an Article of Faith, and pronounces the other Heretical, he then errs in Faith, and is become a Heretick. From whence I observe, that supposing any points in Controversie, not to be so determined as to bring on men an obligation to believe them, those who make them to be Articles of Faith, and condemn the others for Hereticks, are in so doing Hereticks themselves.

Melchior Canus saith, That although a Proposition be thought by wise men to be a matter of Faith, yet if it be not plainly defined by the Church, nor demonstrated by Reason, then the opposing of it is no Heresie, but Erroneous Doctrine. Nay he saith further, That if an Opinion do contradict a point of Catholick Faith in the most probable and almost necessary opinion of all wise men, yet if it do not manifestly contradict, it is barely Erroneous, and not Heretical.

Loc. Theolog.
l. 12. c. 11.

Suarez saith, that Melchior Canus his Doctrine in this matter is generally receiv'd. But he adds one thing more, viz. That in Heresie there must be the highest opposition to immediate Revelation; but if it implies only a repugnancy to a bare Catholick Truth, or Theological conclusion, it is erroneous in Faith, but no Heresie. The highest opposition lies in three things: 1. The Revelation must be immediate, and not deduced by consequence. 2. That it must be most certainly and undoubtedly of Faith. 3. That the Erroneous Proposition do most certainly and undoubtedly contradict it. For, saith he, if there be a defect in any one of these, it is not an Heretical Proposition.

Suarez de Fide
Disp. 19. Sect. 2
n. 13.

These are the Principles laid down by their own Writers of greatest esteem. And therefore if the Replier think fit to make good his Charge of Heresie against the Church of England, he may from hence see what he hath to do.

(1) He must prove the Points in Controversie to be of immediate Divine Revelation; and not drawn from thence by Consequences and Suppositions.

2. That the Doctrine of our Church doth in the highest, plainest, and most certain manner contradict such Propositions of Faith.

And supposing it were possible for him to do the former; yet if their own Expositor of the Articles of our Church may be believed, he can never do the latter. For he endeavours to prove them capable of a Catholick sense. The five first he allows for Catholick as they stand. The sixth about Canonical Scripture, with St. Jerome's explanation, is Catholick enough. The 7th, 8th, first part of the 9th, and the whole 10th, are very Catholick. The four next he examines. The 15th needs only a Gloss of St. Augustins. The 16th very good.

The

The 17th *Catholic*, and so the 18th. The 19th only wants a *Gloss*, and so the 20th and 21. The 22th he examines. 23d is allow'd. The 24th being only against a custom of the Church, he proves from *Canus*, can imply no *Herese*; and yet he thinks it capable of a good *Gloss*. The 25th he allows in the genuine sense of it. The 26th and 27th are confessed to be the *Doctrines* of the Church, and all the *Fathers*. Even the 28th against *Transubstantiation* he thinks may be glossed into a good sense. The 29th is explained from *S. Augustin*. The 30th from *Canus*, not to contain any *Herese*. The 31th he saith only opposes the common opinion. The 32th capable of a sound sense. 33, 34th agreeable to *Scripture* and *Antiquity*. 35th about the *Homilies*, passable. 36th about *Ordination* valid. 37th agreeable to the *French Opinion* and practise. the *Popes Jurisdiction* may be understood of *Temporal*. The two last he allows to be *Catholic*.

So that of 39 *Articles*, but five are reserved for examination, and of these, the 11th he saith, is about words; the 12 and 13 capable of a good sense; the 14th goes upon a mistake of their sense; the 22th determines nothing against the true Faith. I do not go about to justify his Exposition; but I say, that upon your own grounds, it sheweth that our Church cannot be justly charged with *Herese*. For if it be required that such Propositions as are *Heretical* must in the highest and clearest manner contradict the *Doctrines* of Faith; and your own *Expositor* grants they do not; then however you may think them *Erroneous*, yet you cannot condemn them for *Heretical*.

(2) As to *Herese*, a sufficient Proposition of the matters of Faith is required. For they grant that the matters of Faith must be proposed in such a manner as to induce an obligation to believe them, before any can be guilty of *Herese* in rejecting them. Therefore it is necessary for us to know what they mean by a sufficient proposal.

Suarez de Fide
Disp. 19. Sect. 2.
n. 8.
Op. 4. Sect. 2.
n. 3.

Suarez yields this to be a necessary condition; and elsewhere discourses about the nature of it. And there he shews, 1. That a sufficient Proposition of a matter of Faith is not barely to deliver it as a *Divine Truth*; but it must be done with such circumstances, that it may appear to be prudently credible, i.e. so as to see such reason for it, as to put him beyond doubt or fear of the contrary. 2. That it must appear evidently credible to be revealed by God, and therefore certain and infallible. 3. That it must appear not only so, but evidently more credible, than the Doctrine repugnant to it. 4. That according to natural reason, the assent to it is to be prefer'd before the contrary opinion. Now to make good the charge of *Herese* against our Church, he must not bring the *Motives of Credibility* for the
Christian

Christian Faith in general, which are owned on both sides; but as to those points which are asserted by them as matters of Faith, and rejected by us. As for instance, *Transubstantiation* is declared by them to be a *matter of Faith*; and it is denied by us; and they charge us with *Herésie* for it. We say, it hath never been proposed to us in such a manner, as to make it appear to be a prudent judgment in us to believe it, or that it was ever revealed by God, or more credible than the contrary opinion, in the judgment of Reason. Not any one of these things doth appear to us, but the contrary; for we can see nothing of the Credibility, but a great deal for the *evident Incredibility* of it. How then can this matter of Faith be said to be sufficiently proposed to us?

It may be said, *all this is done by the Authority of the Church proposing it; and if it be made evidently credible that you ought to believe the Church, then we are Hereticks for rejecting her Authority.*

I answer, That if by the *Churches Authority*, be meant that of the *Roman Catholick Churches Infallible* proposing matters of Faith to us, we are as far to seek as ever, and for our hearts we cannot find this made out with any degree of *Credibility*. We have searched all your Grounds, examined your Motives, weighed your Reasons, (your miracles we have not seen) but we can meet with nothing that should make it a prudent judgment for us to take all matters of Faith upon trust from her. And if there be no *Evidence of Credibility*, there is no sufficient proposal; and if there be not, there can be no obligation to believe; and where that is not, there can be no *Herésie* in not believing, according to the judgment of your greatest Divines.

(3) As to the charge of *Herésie*, there must be *obstinacy in the party*; which they all make necessary to *formal Herésie*.

Aquinas quotes the noted passage of *St. Augustin* to this purpose, *That although men hold a false opinion, without pertinacious animosity, especially if they derive it from their Parents; and do with diligence and caution seek after the Truth; and are ready to lay it down when they have found it, they are not to be reckon'd for Hereticks.*

And we do not think a better Plea can be made for us as to this charge, than what is contained in these words of *St. Augustin*. But here we must observe the artifice of *Aquinas*. He saw this would never do their business against the enemies of the Church of Rome, and therefore he pretends to give the Reason for this, *because they do not contradict the judgment of the Church*; and so draws the power of declaring *Herésie* to the Pope, as having the chief Authority in the Church. Of whom *St. Augustin* saith not a word. But how-

over *Aquinas* himself requires *Obstinacy* even in this case to make a Heretick. And the *Obstinacy* is not placed by him in the meer resisting the Authority of the Church, but in the manner of doing it.

Cajetan there affirms, that if there be no pertinacy in the Will, there is no *Herese*. So that if a man holds an opinion contrary to Faith in it self, and he thinks he holds right, and doth not intend to dissent from the Church, he is not guilty of *Herese*. And so *Cajetan* defines *Pertinacy* to be a consent to an error in Faith, knowing it so to be.

Non est ergo
hæreticus nisi
qui videns pruden-
tiam doctrinam
eligat Fidei
contrarium. Loc. 12.
c. 9.
Suarez de Fide
Disc. 19. Sect.
3. n. 9.

Melchior Canus saith, It is the general Opinion of Divines and Canonists, that there can be no *Herese* without *Obstinacy*. And no man is a Heretick, he saith, who doth not, seeing and knowing, chuse a Doctrine contrary to Faith.

Suarez saith, that all the Doctors are agreed, that *Obstinacy* is required to *Herese*; and that it is expressed in the Canon Law. So that I need to produce no more to that purpose.

But the difficulty is, to know what they mean by *Obstinacy*. It is not hard to understand what is meant by the word; for *perinax* is one that is over-tenacious, i. e. that holds an opinion, when he sees no ground for it, or will yield to no Reasonable conviction; or that hath not a desire to find out Truth, and submit to it. And so it is plain St. *Augustin* understood it, in the place before mention'd. And in another place, he makes it to lye in a mans resisting the Catholick Doctrine made known to him, without which he did not judge him a Heretick, though he held Heretical Doctrine. And again he declares those to be Hereticks that contumaciously resist those that correct and instruct them, and will not amend their wicked Doctrines, but go on to defend them. These passages of St. *Augustin* are enter'd in the Body of the Canon Law; and the Gloss there saith, If one holds Doctrines against Faith, and be ready to be better instructed, he is no Heretick. The same Authorities *Ockam* insists upon, and from them he declares *Obstinacy* to be so necessary, that without it no man can be a Heretick. And he concludes from St. *Augustin*, that if a man be ready to yield to Truth when he finds it, he is not guilty of *Obstinacy*. And he proves that such are no Hereticks from these Reasons: (1) Because Hereticks are to be Excommunicated; but such by the Canon Law are not to be Excommunicated. (2) Because they are ready to be better instructed (3) Because many have erred and were not accounted Hereticks on this account. *Ockam* distinguishes a twofold *Obstinacy*: 1. Internal. 2. External. Internal may be known, he saith, by the Rules: 1. If a man be not convinced by Miracles. 2. If he will rather question the truth of the Christian Faith, than be convinced.

De Bapt. c.
Donat. 14. c. 16.
De Civit. Dei,
l. 18. c. 51.

C. 24. q. 3.
c. 29, 31.

Ockam Dia-
log. l. 3. c. 3.
&c. c. 6. ad fin.

Cap. 8.
C. 24. q. 1.
Schisma.

L. 4. c. 2.

vinced. 3. When he doth not use means for his own Conviction, but resolves to persist in his Errors, such a neglect argues an obstinate mind.

External, of which he gives many instances, of which I shall mention some, as (1.) If a man willingly saith, or doth something whereby he discovers his disbelief of the whole Christian Faith. (2.) If he denies any part of the *old* or *new Testament*. (3.) If he holds the whole Christian Church to have erred; which he by no means understands of any part of it assuming the Titles of Catholick and Infallible to it self; for he saith, some say, that whatsoever Christ hath promised to his Church, may be made good, if but one Person in it holds the true Faith; but he declares that the *Catholick Faith may be preserved in a very few*. (4.) If the contrary Doctrine be known to be universally received among Christians, as if one should deny that Christ was crucified; and on this account, he charges *John 22.* with Heresy, for denying that the Souls of the Wicked are in Hell, and of the Saints in Heaven before the day of Judgment (5.) If he refuses to be informed, being reproved by the Learned. (6.) If he protests he will never alter his Opinion. (7.) If he forbids reading the Scriptures, or preaching Catholick Doctrine. (8.) If a Pope commands an erroneous Opinion to be believed as matter of Faith. (9.) If a man consents to such a Definition of the Pope, and imposes it on others.

Joh. Gerson treats at large about the *obstinacy* which makes one a Heretick, in several Discourses before the Council of *Constance*; and he follows *St. Augustins* Doctrine in saying, That it consists in not seeking after Truth, and not obeying it when he hath found it.

Melchior Canus, finds fault with the uncertain Marks of *Obstinacy* given by others, and he resolves it at last into this, That a Man holds an Opinion, which he knows to be contrary to the Catholick Faith; but then he requires, (1.) That he be certain that it belongs to it, and it is not enough that learned Men say so. (2.) That he must know it by an infallible Authority. For otherwise a mans persisting in his Opinion, may be great rashness and presumption, but it is not *Heresy*. But in case a persons ignorance be such as makes his Errors involuntary, it doth excuse him from *Heresy*, because that is not a voluntary Error.

Suarez, and others after him, in plain terms make the *Obstinacy* to lie in not submitting to the Judgment of the Church; because, while a Man doth yield to the Churches Authority, they account him no Heretick. This is indeed an Argument according to their way of declaring Hereticks; but we are now enquiring what that *Obstinacy* is, which doth really make a man such. *St. Augustins* opinion is reported by *Aquinas*,

A Vindication of the Answer

as the Reason of his Judgment, that is adopted into the Body of the Canon-law: and therefore, that ought to be the *Standard*, according to which they are to pronounce a Person *obstinate*. If Men do not with Diligence and Caution seek after Truth, and are not willing to embrace it, when they find it, then they are to be accounted *Hereticks* for being *obstinate*. But St. *Augustin* goes no further; however *Suarez* would seem to agree with him: But it is worth the while to consider his Doctrine about it.

N. 11.

(1.) He affirms, That it is not enough for one to be ready to submit to Gods Word, either written or unwritten; but the Submission must be with respect to the Church, as proposing both to us.

Ibid.

(2.) That those who believe any Doctrine, because their Judgment tells them, it is the sense of Scripture; if they therein follow their own Judgment, and not the sense of the Church, they are guilty of such an *Obstinacy*, as makes *Hereticks*.

N. 13.

(3.) That it doth not excuse, if he be willing to believe the Church, if he sees Reasons and Arguments to move him; for this, he saith, is not to believe the Churches Authority as Divine, but after a human manner, which may consist with *Obstinacy* against the Church, as a Rule of Faith.

(4.) That it is not yet necessary in order to this *Obstinacy*, to believe the Church to have *Infallible Authority*, for then those must be excused from *heretical Obstinacy* who denied it: but it is sufficient that the Church is proposed as a true Church, whose Authority he is bound to submit to.

The short of all this matter is, If a Man resolve to believe as the Church believes, a very small thing will excuse him from *Heresy*: but if not, nothing according to *Suarez* will do it: unless it be Ignorance as to the Churches proposing. And this is the modern notion of *Heresy*, which appears to me, to be very unreasonable on these accounts.

(1.) Suppose a Person have a general Disposition of mind to believe whatever is sufficiently proposed to him, as revealed by God, and believes sincerely whatever he knows to be contained in Scripture. I would fain know whether this Disposition of mind do not really excuse him from *heretical Obstinacy*? And yet this is very consistent with doubting whether the Church be accounted as the PropONENT of matters of Faith.

(2.) Is it necessary in order to *heretical Obstinacy*, that the Person believes the PropONENT to be *Infallible* or not? If it be, then none can be convinced of *heretical Obstinacy*, but such as reject the Churches Authority, when they believe it *Infallible*; and then none of us can be charged

charged with it; for we do not believe the Churches Infallibility. If it be not necessary, then the Churches Infallibility is not necessary to Faith; for in order to Heretical Obstinacy, he must be convinced of resisting that which was necessary in order to Faith; from whence it will follow, that the Churches Infallibility is not required as the Ground of Faith.

(3.) Suppose a Person thinks himself bound in Conscience to believe those Guides which God by his Providence hath set over him; and he believes to be sincere and honest: and these tell him, there is no ground to believe on the Churches Authority, as being founded neither in Scripture, nor Antiquity, nor Reason, is not he excused hereby from *Heretical Obstinacy*?

(4.) Suppose he declares himself ready to believe the Churches Authority, if it be sufficiently proposed to him; *i. e.* with such Reasons and Arguments as are proper to convince him; but after all, he declares, that he cannot see any such. And yet *Aquinas* affirms, *No man can believe, unless he sees Reason why he should believe.* 2. 2 q 1. art. 4. How then can a man be liable to *Heretical Obstinacy*, because he only refuses to believe, when he sees no Reason to believe?

(5.) Suppose he doth believe that which the Church proposes, not merely upon its *Authority*, but upon the *Reasons* which the Church offers; why must this man be liable to *Heretical Obstinacy*, for believing upon the Churches Reasons? What a wonderful nice thing is *Heresie* made? It seems by this rare Doctrine, it doth not excuse from *Heresie* to believe even Truth it self, if it be upon grounds of Reason which the Church it self gives. But it must be taken merely from the *Churches Authority*; and yet that very Authority must be believed on the grounds of Reason, or the *Motives of Credibility*.

(6.) Suppose a Person hath used the best means he could to find out his Obligation to believe on the Churches Authority, and after all, he cannot find any such thing, what Obligation is he under to enquire farther; and from whence doth it arise? And if he be not under any, how can he be guilty of *Heretical Obstinacy*, who is under no Obligation to search any farther? For *Obstinacy* must suppose resisting some Obligation.

(7.) Suppose he be willing to believe on the *Churches Authority*, if that Church be made appear to him to be the *One Catholick Church* of Christ, but when he comes to examine this, he finds that he must exclude very great and considerable Parts of the Catholick Church, to reduce the *Authority* of the Catholick Church to that of the

A Vindication of the Answer

the *Roman Communion*; how can it then be *Heretical Obstnacy* not to suppose a *Part* to be the *Whole*?

(8.) Suppose he hath overcome this, yet if he should mistake about the Seat of *Infallibility*, is he not still as liable to the charge of *Heretical Obstnacy*, because the true Reason of it is, that such a Person rejects that which God hath chosen as the proper means to propound matters of Faith to us: But if he should be mistaken in the true Proponent, he is in as much danger of *Heretical Obstnacy* still. As suppose a man takes a General Council, as representing the *Catholick Church*, to be the only true Proponent of Faith; and therefore rejects the Authority of the Pope in this matter, I desire to know, whether this be *Heretical Obstnacy*, or not? If not, then rejecting the true Proponent, doth not make any liable to it: If it doth, then there is *Heretical Obstnacy* in the Church of *Rome*, as well as out of it. And so much in Answer to the Repliers Charge of *Heretic* on the Church of *England*.

(3.) The next Charge relates to the *Insufficient Authority* of the Church of *England*, and that on these Accounts:

(1.) In that it leaves every man to judge for himself.

(2.) Because she dares not use the true Arguments against Sects, for fear of their being turned upon her self.

(3.) Because she denies an Appeal to an higher Judicature:

(1.) It is urged in the Papers, *That among us every man thinks himself as competent a Judge of Scripture, as the very Apostles.*

It was answer'd, That every man among us doth not pretend to an Infallible Spirit, but all yield the Apostles had it. And by being a Judge of Scripture, if no more be meant, than that every man must use his Understanding about it, that was no more than was necessary in order to the believing the matters contained in it: But if by being a Judge of Scripture, was meant, giving such a Judgment as obliges others to submit to it, then it was denied, that every man among us is allow'd to judge of it. But yet we own the Authority of the Guides of the Church, and a due submission to them; but we do not allow them to be as competent Judges of Scriptures as the very Apostles.

This seems to me to be a full and clear Answer.

But the Replier offers some things against it.

(1.) *That I suppose Men cannot be deceived in understanding the Scriptures; and consequently their Spirit is infallible.*

I never said; or thought, that they could not be deceived; but I said, they must use their Understandings, to prevent being deceived,
and

and must judg of the sense of what they are to believe in the Scriptures, in order to their own Salvation.

But he saith, *Whosoever uses his Understanding in opposition to the Churches Tradition, makes himself a Judg indeed, but not to his own Salvation.*

To make this matter clear, we must consider, *That Matters of Faith necessary to Salvation, are of another nature from Matters of Controversie concerning the Sense of Scripture in doubtful places.*

As to the matters necessary to Salvation to particular persons, we assert the Scriptures to be so plain, and the Tradition of the Church as to the Creeds, so well known and attested, that no man without gross and culpable neglect, can mistake about them; but in case of invincible or unaffected ignorance, their Errors shall not be laid to their charge, and so their mistakes shall not hinder their Salvation: And herein we assert no more than we can justifie, not only from Scripture, Reason, and Antiquity, but from the best of their own Writers, who assert,

1. That there are some Points of Faith necessary to be explicitly believed by all in order to Salvation; for altho they say there may be such invincible ignorance of them, as may excuse from sin in not believing them; yet without believing them, they are not capable of Salvation. As to the *prima credibilia*, as *Aquinas* calls them, he determines, *That everyman is bound to believe them explicitly*, as much as he is bound to have Faith; but as to other things, a preparation of mind is sufficient to believe all contained in Scripture, and so much explicitly, as is made plain to him to be contained therein. From whence it follows, That by the Doctrine of the Schools, every man is to judg what he is to believe; for his Words are, *Quando hoc ei constiterit*, when it is made clear to him; and how can any thing be made clear to a man, unless he be the Judg of it?

2. 2. q. 3.

2. That particular persons may certainly know what is sufficient to their Salvation by the inward assistance of Divine Grace, without depending on the Churches Infallibility. This follows from what is mention'd before concerning the Divine Gifts which accompany Grace. And so much is owned by *Melchior Canus*, as to what is necessary for every man as to his own state and condition. So that the greatest Divines of the Roman Church do yield all we contend for, as to the Matters necessary to Salvation.

Loc. 2. c. 8.
Concedimus enim liberaliter doctrinam, cuique in sua vita & statu necessariam illi fore perspetam & cognitam, qui fecerit voluntatem Dei.

The only Question is about Matters of Controversie raised in the Church concerning the Sense of Scripture; and as to these they yield these material Points:

1. That

A Vindication of the Answer

(1) That an Implicit Faith as to what is contained in Scripture, is sufficient; and that particular persons are bound to no more, till the Doctrine be made clear to them, which appears from the words of *Aquinas* lately mentioned.

*Deus Natura
Gratia Probl.
15. p. 96*

2. That particular Persons may disbelieve many things determined by the Church, without sin. 'Tis his *Sancta Clara* proves from *Vega* and others: and he saith himself, *Their Ignorance in such cases, is either invincible, or at least such as excuses from sin.* And he farther saith,

P. 97,

3. That it is the common opinion of the *Schools*, and of their *Divines*, That *Laymen erring with their Teachers, are excused from any fault, and as long as it is out of obedience to their Teachers, it is rather a meritorious Act.*

Let us now lay these things to the present Case, and all the Difficulty will soon disappear.

As to the *Matters of Salvation*, they grant that God will not suffer those to be deceived about them, who do sincerely seek after the knowledge of them.

As to *Matters of Controversie*, they are in no danger, if they trust their *Spiritual Guides*.

And I asserted that we owned the Authority of Guides in the Church, and a due submission to them.

But the Replier is not satisfied with this, for he saith,

2. *That no other submission is sufficient, but such as men lose Heaven without it.* This is somewhat hard to understand: Doth he in earnest think men cannot go to Heaven without a blind Obedience to the Church? Is there no allowance to be made for Ignorance, Education, reasonable Doubts? Is all other submission to Authority in the Church merely *ad Pompam*? But this Gentleman did not take time to consider the Doctrine of their own *Schools* about these matters, for I cannot imagine he could be ignorant of it.

Def. p. 49.

But the Defender seems to be wholly unacquainted with it, otherwise he could not talk so crudely and unskilfully as he doth, about *mens Judgment in matters that concern their Salvation*. And he may now see how far their own *Divines* allow particular persons to be competent Judges about matters that relate to their own Salvation: and therefore I need give him no other Answer, till he hath better informed himself about these things: but we have been upon such a Point as may in some measure excuse him, but not those who ought to understand their own Doctrine better.

(2) The

(2.) The next Argument to prove the *Insufficient Authority* of the Church of England, was, That she dares not bring the true Arguments against the other Sects, for fear they should be turned against themselves, and confuted by their own Arguments.

To this it was answered, That the Church of England did wisely disown the pretence of *Infallibility*, and made use of the best Arguments against Sectaries from a just Authority, and the Sinfulness and Folly of the Sectaries refusing to submit to it.

To take off the force of this Answer, two different Ways are taken.

(1.) The Replier saith, *The Argument is as forcible without Infallibility as with it.* In- Repl. p. 32.

(2.) The Defender saith, *Authority signifies nothing in this Case without Infallibility.* Def. p. 51.

I shall consider them both, tho both cannot stand together.

(1.) The Replier goes upon this Ground; That the Church of England can never justly charge Sectaries with *Disobedience to Her*, because they may as well cast it in her Teeth, that she disobeyed her Mother Church, whether she were *Infallible* or not.

But the Force of this depends upon a double Mistake.

(1.) That the Church of Rome hath as much Authority over our Church, as the Rulers of it have over the Members. Which ought not to have been supposed, but substantially proved, since the Weight of the Cause depends upon it. But I see nothing like a Proof produced.

(2.) That the Sectaries have as much reason to reject the Terms of Communion required by our Church, as our Church had to reject those of the Church of Rome. But this is as far from being proved as the other.

(2.) The Defender desires to be instructed, how such an Authority can be in a Church without *Infallibility*? I hope he believes there may be Authority without *Infallibility*; or else how shall Fathers govern their Children? But not in the Church. Why so? Have not Bishops, out of Councils, Authority to rule their Diocesses? Have they not a Provincial Synods Authority to make Canons, tho they be not *Infallible*? What then is the meaning of this? He tells us soon after; To say a Church is *Fallible*, is to say she may be deceived. There is no doubt of that. And if she may be deceived her self, they may be deceived who follow her. And if a Church pretends to be *Infallible*, which is not, she certainly deceives those that follow her, and that without Remedy. But all

this sort of Reasoning, proceeds upon a false Suggestion, viz. That our Faith must be grounded on the Chuach's Authority as the *formal Reason* of it. Which he knows, is utterly denied by us, and ought to have been proved. We declare, *the Ground of our Faith is the Word of God*; not interpreted by Fancy, but by the Consent of the whole Christian Church from the Apostles Times. This is our Bottom, or if you will, *the Rock* on which our Church is built. This is far more firm and durable, than a pretence to Infallibility; which is like a desperate Remedy, which Men never run to, but when they see nothing else will help them. Had the Church of *Rome* been able to defend her Innovations by Reason or Antiquity, she had never thought of Infallibility. It is a much better expedient to keep Men in Error, than to keep them from it; and tends more to save the Authority of a sinking Church, than the Souls of Men.

But he will not let the Church's Infallibility go thus; For he pretends to prove, *that if we take that away, we make Christianity the most unreasonable Thing in Nature; nay, absolutely impossible.* What! whether God hath promised to make the Church Infallible or not! We understand those who offer to prove the Church Infallible by Scripture; but these *Scientifical Men* despise such beaten Roads, and when they offer to demonstrate, fall short of the others Probabilities. As will appear by examining his Argument: *Faith requires an assent to a thing as absolutely true; but a fallible Authority cannot oblige me to a thing as absolutely true; and therefore this would be an Effect without a Cause; a down-right Impossibility; a flat Contradiction.* I will match his Argument with another; Faith is not an Assent to a thing as absolutely true, upon less than a Divine Testimony; but the Church's Testimony is not Divine; and therefore to believe upon the Church's Testimony, is an Effect without a Cause; a down-right Impossibility; a flat Contradiction.

Let him set one of these against the other, and see who makes Faith unreasonable or impossible. But I will clear this Matter in few words. I grant that Faith is an Assent to a thing as absolutely true; and that what is absolutely true, is impossible to be false: I grant, that a meer fallible Authority is not sufficient to produce an Act of Faith. But here I distinguish the Infallible Authority of God revealing (into which my Faith is resolved, as into the formal Reason of it) from the Authority of the Church conveying that Revelation, which is only the Means by
which

which this Revelation comes to be known to us : As when a Man swears by the Bible, there is a difference between the Contents of that Book by which he swears, and the Officers putting the Book into his hands.

(3.) The Church of England is blamed, for allowing no Liberty of Appeals to a higher Judicature.

The Question is, Whether this makes her no true Church ; or not to have any just Authority over her own Members ?

The Replier saith, *She makes her self the last Tribunal of Spirit* Repl. p. 33.
tual Doctrine.

I know not where she hath done so, since we own the Authority of Free and truly General Councils, as the Supreme Tribunal of the Church upon Earth. And accordingly receive the four first ; which even *S. Gregory the Great* distinguished from those that followed, as to their Authority and Veneration.

The Defender had a good mind to cut off the Church of England Def. p. 54.
from being a Church, because she hath renounced Communion with the Church of Rome ; but his heart failed him : And I hope he will think better of it, when he sees cause to prove a little more effectually, that the Church of Rome in its largest extent is the Catholick Church.

He argues, *That there must be such an Authority in a Church, which* Page 55.
may give a final Sentence conclusive to the Parties, as the Judges do Temporal Differences. But is it necessary for all Churches to have such a Power ? then there must be as many Supreme Courts as there are Churches. If not, we desire to know where the Supreme Court is, and who appointed it ? And where Christ hath ever promised to his Church a Power to end Controversies when they arise, as effectually as Judges do Temporal Differences ? For the freest and most General Councils yet assembled, have not been so happy ; and those we look on as the most Venerable Authority to decide Differences in the Church.

But still our Church wants sufficient Authority, in his Opinion. Page 56.
Doth it want Authority to govern its own Members ? To Reform Abuses in a divided State of the Catholick Church ? To cast off an usurped Power, as it was judged by the Clergy in Convocation, who yet concurred in other things with the Church of Rome ? I pray what Authority had the *Gallican Church* so lately to declare against the *Pope's Infalibility*, and to reduce him in that respect to the Case of an ordinary Bishop ? If Absolute Obedience be due to him as *Head of the Church*, what Authority have the

this sort of Reasoning, proceeds upon a false Suggestion, viz. That our Faith must be grounded on the Chuach's Authority as the *formal Reason* of it. Which he knows, is utterly denied by us, and ought to have been proved. We declare, *the Ground of our Faith is the Word of God*; not interpreted by Fancy, but by the Consent of the whole Christian Church from the Apostles Times. This is our Bottom, or if you will, *the Rock* on which our Church is built. This is far more firm and durable, than a pretence to Infallibility; which is like a desperate Remedy, which Men never run to, but when they see nothing else will help them. Had the Church of *Rome* been able to defend her Innovations by Reason or Antiquity, she had never thought of Infallibility. It is a much better expedient to keep Men in Error, than to keep them from it; and tends more to save the Authority of a sinking Church, than the Souls of Men.

But he will not let the Church's Infallibility go thus; For he pretends to prove, *that if we take that away, we make Christianity the most unreasonable Thing in Nature; nay, absolutely impossible.* What! whether God hath promised to make the Church Infallible or not! We understand those who offer to prove the Church Infallible by Scripture; but these *Scientifical Men* despise such beaten Roads, and when they offer to demonstrate, fall short of the others Probabilities. As will appear by examining his Argument: *Faith requires an assent to a thing as absolutely true; but a fallible Authority cannot oblige me to a thing as absolutely true; and therefore this would be an Effect without a Cause; a down-right Impossibility; a flat Contradiction.* I will match his Argument with another; Faith is not an Assent to a thing as absolutely true, upon less than a Divine Testimony; but the Church's Testimony is not Divine; and therefore to believe upon the Church's Testimony, is an Effect without a Cause; a down-right Impossibility; a flat Contradiction.

Let him set one of these against the other, and see who makes Faith unreasonable or impossible. But I will clear this Matter in few words. I grant that Faith is an Assent to a thing as absolutely true; and that what is absolutely true, is impossible to be false: I grant, that a meer fallible Authority is not sufficient to produce an Act of Faith. But here I distinguish the Infallible Authority of God revealing (into which my Faith is resolved, as into the formal Reason of it) from the Authority of the Church conveying that Revelation, which is only the Means by
which

which this Revelation comes to be known to us : As when a Man swears by the Bible, there is a difference between the Contents of that Book by which he swears, and the Officers putting the Book into his hands.

(3.) The Church of England is blamed, for allowing no Liberty of Appeals to a higher Judicature.

The Question is, Whether this makes her no true Church ; or not to have any just Authority over her own Members ?

The Replier saith, *She makes her self the last Tribunal of Spirit.* Repl. p. 33. *tual Doctrine.*

I know not where she hath done so, since we own the Authority of Free and truly General Councils, as the Supreme Tribunal of the Church upon Earth. And accordingly receive the four first ; which even *S. Gregory the Great* distinguished from those that followed, as to their Authority and Veneration.

The Defender had a good mind to cut off the Church of England *Def. p. 54.* from being a Church, because she hath renounced Communion with the Church of Rome ; but his heart failed him : And I hope he will think better of it, when he sees cause to prove a little more effectually, that the Church of Rome in its largest extent is the *Catholic Church.*

He argues, *That there must be such an Authority in a Church, which* Page 55. *may give a final Sentence conclusive to the Parties, as the Judges do Temporal Differences.* But is it necessary for all Churches to have such a Power ? then there must be as many Supreme Courts as there are Churches. If not, we desire to know where the Supreme Court is, and who appointed it ? And where Christ hath ever promised to his Church a Power to end Controversies when they arise, as effectually as Judges do Temporal Differences ? For the freest and most General Councils yet assembled, have not been so happy ; and those we look on as the most Venerable Authority to decide Differences in the Church.

But still our Church wants sufficient Authority, in his Opinion. Page 55. Doth it want Authority to govern its own Members ? To Reform Abuses in a divided State of the Catholic Church ? To cast off an usurped Power, as it was judged by the Clergy in Convocation, who yet concurred in other things with the Church of Rome ? I pray what Authority had the *Gallican Church* so lately to declare against the *Pope's Infallibility*, and to reduce him in that respect to the Case of an ordinary Bishop ? If Absolute Obedience be due to him as *Head of the Church,* what Authority have the

A Vindication of the Answer

Temporal Princes in other Countries, sometimes to forbid, sometimes to restrain and limit the *Pope's Bulls*. This at least shews, that there may be just Authority to examine and restrain the Pope's Power. And I see no Reason, why the several Churches of Christendom may not act as well against the Pretence of the *Pope's Authority*, as the Gallican Church hath done against his *Infallibility*; especially, since this Gentleman hath told us, *that Authority without Infallibility, signifies nothing*. And those who think they may examine and reject his Dictates, may do the same by his Authority, the one being as liable as the other.

It was said in the Papers, *That no Country can subsist in Quiet, where there is not a Supreme Judge, from whom there can be no Appeal*.

The Answer was, That the natural Consequence was then, that every National Church ought to have the Supreme Power within it self. But how comes Appeals to a Foreign Jurisdiction to tend to the Peace and Quiet of a Church?

Page 57.

The Defender saith; *That a National to the whole Church, is but as a Shire to a Kingdom; and a very natural and consistent Consequence it is, that every Shire should have a King*.

One would think by such an Answer, this Defender is a mighty Stranger to the ancient Polity of the Church. Did he never hear of the Power of *Metropolitans* being settled by the Council of *Nice* for governing the Churches, and calling *Provincial Synods*? Did he never hear of many other *Canons* relating to the Power and Frequency of *Provincial Synods*? Did he never hear of the Decrees of the Council of *Ephesus*, forbidding all *Incroachments on the ancient Rights of Churches*? Did he never hear that *Provincial Councils* have declared Matters of Faith, without so much as advising with the Bishop of *Rome*? As the African Councils did in the *Pelagian Controversy*; and the Councils of *Toledo*, in the Case of *Arianism*; which reformed the *Spanish Churches*, and made *Canons* by their own Authority; which were confirmed by their Kings, *Reccaredus* and *Sisenandus*? Did he never hear that it was good Doctrine among Catholic Divines, *That particular Churches might take upon them to declare the true Catholic Faith*? And if so, they must judge what is so. Did he never hear, that in a divided State of the Church, *Errors and Abuses may be reformed by particular Churches*? And that this was owned and defended by great Men in the Church of *Rome*? If he did not, he was very much unprovided for the handling such a Controversy; if he did know these things, he ought not to have spoken with so much contempt

contempt of the Power of Particular or National Churches.

And to assert their Authority, is very far from being like *setting up a King in every Shire*; for this were the highest Disloyalty to the King, who hath a just and unquestionable Authority over all the Shires. Let him prove that the Pope hath such a *Monarchy* over all *particular Churches*, before he make such a Parallel again. But the way he takes is rather like making the Imperial Crown of this Realm to be in subjection to a Foreign Power, because the Roman Emperors once had Dominion here, and therefore this Kingdom could never recover its own Rights.

But he saith, *A Foreign Jurisdiction is hardly sense with respect to* Pag. 55. *the Church, for Foris is out, and unless the ultimate Jurisdiction be out of the Church, it cannot be said to be foreign.* This is a shameful begging of the Question, that what they call the *Roman Catholick Church*, is the *Catholick Church*; for if it be not (which I hope I have sufficiently shewn) then the pretended and usurped Jurisdiction of the *Roman Church* over the Church of *England*, is a *Foreign Jurisdiction*.

He adds, *That it is impossible to re-settle the Church among us,* Pag. 58. *without that which we call Foreign Jurisdiction; because Dissentions in matters of Religion cannot otherwise be removed.*

But suppose this *Foreign Jurisdiction* be the occasion of these Dissentions? some maintaining, others asserting the Rights of our Church against it; Is not this *Foreign Jurisdiction* like to put an end to it? Yes certainly: For, if all Parties submit, there will be no longer disputing. But our Question, as yet, is, whether this be reasonable or not?

I complained of the Inconvenience of Appeals to a Foreign Jurisdiction. He gives us a smart Answer, and saith, *That holds no* Pag. 55. *comparison with the Inconvenience of Heresy.* As tho' it were so plain a thing that we are guilty of Heresy, that it needed no manner of proof. Alas! what need a Man prove that it is day when the Sun shines? We are just as much guilty of *Heresy*, as the good Bishop was, who, for denying the Antipodes, was condemned by Pope Zachary. But it is a comfortable thing in a Charge of *Heresy*, to find it no better proved.

He saith, *I mistook the matter of Appeals, and that it was not under-* Pag. 59. *stood with respect to Causes, but to matters of Doctrine and Worship.*

An Appeal must relate to a *Superiour Authority*; and a constant Appeal to a *standing Authority*; and whatever the pretence be, the Court of Rome will challenge *Supreme Jurisdiction*, where-ever the Pope

A Vindication of the Answer

Pope is owned as Head of the Church: And then all those Consequences will follow I mentioned before. If other kind of Appeals were meant in the Papers, yet they must relate to an Authority Superior to our Church; which we could wish had been more fully expressed, that we might have known to whom the Appeal was to be made; whether to a free General Council, which we never disowned; or to the Popes Authority, which we yet see no cause to make our Appeals to, especially as to what concerns his own Jurisdiction.

Pag. 62.

He pleads, That Supream Power must be Judge in its own Cause; for no Authority ought to be set up against the King, supposing a Question be started about his Prerogative.

I answer; This is a Case extremely different: for in matters of *Prerogative*, the King's Supream Power is not the Question; for his Right to the Imperial Crown is, and ought to be out of dispute; but all the Question that can be started, must relate only to the Exercise of his Power, in some particular Cases, where former Laws made by the King's Consent, are supposed to limit it; which the Courts of Judicature take Cognizance of, and so are a kind of Legal Arbitrators between the King and his People.

But in the Case before us, the Jurisdiction it self, and the Right to exercise any such Authority, is the very thing in Question. And I desire this Gentleman to resolve me, whether in the late times of Usurpation this had been good Doctrine, that those who enjoy, or pretend to Supream Power, are to be Judges in their own Case? If so, then it had been impossible for Men to have justified their Loyalty to the Royal Family, then very unjustly put out of Possession. If not, then there may be a pretence to Supream Authority, where it is by no means allowable for the Pretender to Judge in his own Cause.

Pag. 63.

As to his *Appeal to the Catholick Church*; we by no means reject it, provided he mean the Church truly Catholick, as it comprehends the Apostolical Church in the first place; and then all other Christian Churches, which from the Apostles times have delivered down the Catholick Doctrine and Worship, which they received from them. But if he means that which is called a *Catholick Church*, but is neither Catholick nor Apostolical; we beg his pardon, if we allow no Appeal to it, since its Errors and Corruptions are the great and just Cause of our Complaints.

Pag. 64, 65.

He runs into a long Discourse about *Church-Security*, and his design is to shew there can be none without *Infallibility*.

Infallibility is no doubt a very good thing, but where is it to be had? Is it not possible for Men both to be deceived and to deceive, with a pretence of Infallibility? All that we desire is to see some Infallible Proofs of it; without which all the talk about it doth not end one Controversy, but beget many. And this kind of Talk is, as if a Man were to advise with two Lawyers about making a Purchase, but would fain be secure of a good Title; the one desires to see all the Evidences that belong to the Estate, and after the perusal of all, he tells him, that as far as he can possibly discern, the Title is very good, and he would venture all he had upon it. He goes to another, and tells him what the former had said to him. And was this all, saith he? Would he not say, it was impossible for you to be cheated? No. And will you venture your Money without such Security? Why, saith the Client, what would you have me to do? I will tell you, saith he, there is but one way in the World for you to be safe. What is that, Sir. I should be glad to know it with all my Heart? I will discover it to you, provided you follow my Counsel; and that is, to deal with a Man who hath such a Gift from Heaven bestowed upon him, that he never did, nor ever can deceive you, and then it is impossible you should be cheated: for, all these Deeds and Writings, and Lawyers, may deceive you; but if you deal with such a Man, you are safe enough. I thank you, Sir, saith the Client, for your good Advice; but I pray, where is there such a Man to be found? For, if I cannot find him out, I am just where I was before, and I must use the best means I can, and rather trust to good Deeds and real Honesty, than wait for a Chimerical Infallibility.

It is alledged still, *That without infallibility, we have not Judgment but Fancy.* Pag. 65.

And the Replier saith, *That in Competition with the Churches Authority all is but Fancy.* Repl. p. 34.

The difference of these must depend upon the Reason we produce; and by that we are still content *the World should judge*, so we understand those, who are unprejudiced in it.

It was said in the Papers, *That if the Fancies of those who are now for the Church of England vary, they are ready, or (as the Defender saith it ought to be read) really to embrace or joyn with the next Congregation of People, whose Discipline or Worship agrees with their Opinion at that time.*

I will take his own Reading, which in my Opinion alters the matter very little; for still it implies, *That those of the Church*
of

of *England* have nothing to hold them to it, but a present Fancy, and when that varies, they may as well be of another Perswasion; for Fancy, we all know, is a very mutable thing.

But, to shew that those of the Church of *England* are not so apt to vary their Fancies or Opinions in these matters, I alledged their adhering to the Crown in the times of Rebellion.

Pag. 66.

He answers, *That my Zeal for the Church of England is wonderful unlucky.* I am sorry if it prove so, since I unfeignedly design to serve her, and therefore should be much more concerned, if I should do her Injury under a pretence of Service. But wherein is it? He confesses, *The Doctrine of our Church is in this Point very Orthodox, and her Practice in the times of Rebellion conformable to it.* And what was the Practice of the Church then, but the firmness of the Members of it? But many, he saith, *deserted Her and her Doctrine in this Point at that time, so many that the Rebellion was peradventure indebted for its success to those Deserters.* But they were Deserters still; and the Practice of the Church of *England* was agreeable to her Doctrine, by his own Confession. How then comes this to shew, that it is only a variable Fancy which keeps Men to it? He saith, *If those who deserted her, had ever adhered to her with a Perswasion, that they were obliged to believe what she taught, they could not have deserted her in this Point, who always taught Loyalty; and till they do so, there is no security of adhering to her.*

This seems to me to be a *wonderous unlucky Answer.* For doth *Infallibility* secure a Church against Deserters? Have no Men, no Provinces, no whole Nations deserted a Church which pretends to *Infallibility*? And since there may be such Multitudes of Deserters, where *Infallibility* is challenged, what greater Security can that give against them, more than our Church doth? Nay, I think so much the less, because the very pretence to *Infallibility* is suspicious and hard to be made out, and every Error overthrows it. And I do not think the Church of *Rome* did her self greater Mischief, or made more total Deserters by any one thing, than by pretending to be *Infallible*. For, when such gross Errors and Corruptions were complained of, that one of the Popes at that time confessed them, and owned the necessity of a Reformation, when the Princes of the Roman Communion called for it, and pressed it very hard by their Ambassadors in the Council of *Trent* (as appears by the French Collection of *Memoires* relating to it) when after all, no one thing, as to Doctrine or Worship, could be redressed, it convinced the World, that let things be as they

they would, they would Reform nothing ; this made the Breach irreconcilable. For, till the Council of *Trent* was ended and confirmed, there was still hopes of Reconciliation, upon a due Explication of some Points, Reforming Abuses, and leaving School-Doctrines at liberty ; but when they saw every thing defended, and the Errors complained of, made Articles of Faith, and put into a New Creed, there was no hopes of any Accommodation left. And all this was the blessed Effect of pretending to *Infallibility* ; for if one Error had been owned, there had been no farther pretending to that.

It is some comfort however, that our Church is confessed to teach the *Orthodox Doctrine of Loyalty*, and her Practice to be conformable in the worst of Times ; and so I hope it will always be. But it hath been said by some Body, *That we had our Government and Ceremonies from his Church, our Doctrine from Luther and Calvin ; and that we had nothing peculiar to our Church, but our Doctrine of Non-Resistance ; and much good may it do us.* And we hope we shall never fare the worse for it. This might give occasion to enquire, Whether the Church which pretends to be Infallible, doth teach it so *Orthodoxly* or not ? Or whether those who do think themselves obliged to believe what she teaches, are thereby obliged to the strictest Principles of Loyalty ? But I forbear. It is sufficient to my Purpose to shew, that our Church doth not only teach them, as her own Doctrine ; but which is far more effectual, as the Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, and of the Primitive Church ; which I think ought to have more force on the Consciences of Men, than the pretence to *Infallibility* in any Church in the World.

But all this while it is said, *There is no firm Motive produced for adhering to the Doctrine of our Church.* P. 67, 68. And this is repeated over and over : As though there could be any greater Motive in the World, than that our Doctrine is no other than that of Christ and his Apostles. And unless you prove this as to the Doctrine of the *Church of Rome*, all your other *Motives* signify nothing to the real satisfaction of any Man's Conscience. For it is agreed on all hands, that our Religion is a revealed Religion ; and that this Revelation was made by Christ and his Apostles : and that this Revelation, as to Matters necessary to Salvation, is contained in the Books of the New Testament. What satisfaction then can it be to any Man's Conscience, to be told, such a Church tells

A Vindication of the Answer

me this and that, and the other Point were the Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles? As will appear by this short Representation. You pretend to no new Revelations of Matter of Doctrine? *No.* You have the Books of this Revelation? *Yes.* Are they not legible? *Yes.* But you cannot understand them. Let me try; It is for God's sake I must believe, and therefore I cannot be satisfied till I see his Word. *What! will you not believe the Church which delivers you the Word?* I pray excuse me. A Man brings me a Letter from my Father, about matter of great Consequence to me; he tells me, I need not look into the Letter it self, for he was authorized by my Father to tell me his Meaning: Altho I believe he dealt faithfully in bringing me the true Letter; Do you think I will trust him for the Meaning of it? No; I will open it, if it be only to see, whether he had such Authority from him or not. And I know, if my Father was pleased to write to me about Matters of such Importance, he would write in such a manner that I might understand him; and if any Difficulties arise in Point of Law, I will take the Advice of those who are most fit and able to direct me. But after all, I must know what my Father would have me to do from his own Words, and not from the Mouth of the Messenger. Or if he tells me he hath Authority to deliver other things by Word of Mouth, not contained in the Letter, which I am equally bound to believe with what I can find in it; can any one think I will believe him, unless it appears by the Letter it self that my Father gave him such Authority? Let him tell me never so much, how long he hath been my Father's Servant, and how faithful he hath been to him, and how much he hath done and suffered for him, and what a number of Certificates he can produce, from time to time, of his good Behaviour; yet all this can give me no satisfaction, as long as the Letter he brings is confessed to be my Father's own Hand-writing; and that it was purposely sent to direct me what I was to do in a Matter that he knew to be of the greatest Concernment in the World to me. Can I imagine one so wise and careful, should omit setting down in his own Letter such important Things, and leave them to the discretion of one that may either mistake his Meaning, or have some Interest to carry on different from mine? And therefore all the fair Pretences or Motives in the World, shall never make me believe any thing to be his Mind for me to do, in a Matter which relates to my Welfare, but what I find under his own Hand.

It is to very little purpose to quote *S. Augustin's Motives about* Pag. 67.
the Church, unless it be made appear that they belong only to
 the *Church of Rome*; and that they prove the *Church Infalible* in
 all she teaches. Our Faith depends on the Word of God, as it
 is contained in Scripture: this Scripture is conveyed down by
 the Church; but the Church still is but the Messenger which brings
 the Letter, by which we are directed what to believe and pra-
 ctise in order to Salvation.

We do by no means think *the Word of God is made by writing*, as Pag. 69.
 he suggests; but we are sure it is the Word of God which is
 written, which we can never be of any Tradition. *We do not*
look out for a fallible Judg., to be sure to have an end of our *Diffe-*
rences: But we hate to be imposed on, by a pretence to an *Infalli-*
ble Judg., who instead of ending Differences, makes more. *We*
do not think it Judgment to affirm, that giving Honour to God, is not
giving Honour to God: But we have not such deep Understandings
 to comprehend how God should be honoured by the breaking his
 Commandments.

It is not Judgment in our Opinion to think, *That because only*
one could redeem us, no Body besides can pray for us: But it is no
 great Wisdom and Judgment, if God hath appointed but one
 Advocate in Heaven, for us to appoint him more; or to make
 our Addressees to our Fellow-Creatures in Heaven, when he hath
 commanded us to do it to his Son. We do not believe *that the*
Body and Blood of Christ can now be separated, or he die again: But
 when Christ instituted a Sacrament to set forth the shedding of
 his Blood, that it is meer Fancy to think his Blood being in his
 Body, doth answer the Ends of it. The Apostles no doubt un-
 derstood Christ's meaning in what he said, and have so well in-
 structed his Church therein, that we have no reason to believe he
 meant *the substantial Change of his Body*, in the Institution of a
 Sacrament. Now on which side *Judgment and Reason* lies, these
 very Instances discover. And we desire no greater Liberty in
 these Matters, than to have our Judgments sway'd by the strongest
 Reason; and that I hope is not *building on Sand*.

Pag. 70.

The Replier saith; *The Infalible Church is as visible as the Sun*.
 We are then *wondrous unlucky* indeed that cannot see it: I have of-
 ten rubbed my Eyes, and looked over and over, where they
 tell me it is to be seen, and I can yet see nothing like it; al-
 though I should be as glad to see it as another. I have heard of a

Repl. p. 36.

blind Man, who pretended to have such a sagacity with his Fingers, that he could feel Colours ; and he proceeded so far in it, that some *Vertuoso's* believed him, and were ready to form a Theory of Colours from the subtilty of the blind Man's Fingers ; but before they had accomplished it, the Trick was discovered. An Infallible Judg of all Controversies looks to me just like it ; He is to determine Controversies, not by *seeing*, but by a kind of *feeling*. If he produces Reason, we may judg as well as he ; if he doth not, he must feel them out ; which is so different a way from the proceeding of the rest of Mankind, that for my part, I must be content rather to grope in the darkness of common Reason, than be directed by the Light of this invisible *Sun-shine*.

Pag. 71.

The Defender here comes in with his *Dish* and his *Stand* ; which are Metaphors somewhat too mean for such a Subject, and are apt to turn one's Stomach more than Repetition. The Question is, Whether those who allow the use of our Judgments in the choice of a Church, have Reason to find fault with it in other things ; because the Difficulties about an Infallible Church, are as great as about any other Point in Religion ?

The Replier again saith ; *The Church is a Noon-day Light*. Then, what *Cimmerians* are we ? *Tully* questioned, Whether *some God, or Nature, or the Situation of the Place, hindred a whole Nation that they could never see the Sun* ? But our Modern Geographers put an end to this Dispute, telling us, there are no People in the World who cannot see the Sun at some time or other. And we are apt to think, if there were such a Sun-shine of the Churches Infallibility, we should be able to discern it, unless the Light of it may be thought to dazle our Eyes ; for, we are as willing to find it as they ; but the Difficulties about it are such as we cannot conquer. And there need no *Telescopes* to find out the Sun.

Pag. 75.

But the Defender will not yield that there are any such Difficulties about the Church's Infallibility ; for he hath but one thing to mind, and that no Difficulty neither, where, or which the Church is. I hope when he hath considered the former Discourses, he will not think it so easy a matter to find out the Church he talketh of, viz. One Infallible Catholick Church.

But the Difficulties about Scripture are greater ; as about the Canon, Translation, and Sense of it.

The Question proceeds upon a Person who in earnest desires to satisfy himself in this Matter; Whether in order to his Salvation, he must follow the Directions of Scripture, or the Church? And I doubt not to make it appear, that the Difficulties are greater about the Church than the Scripture. That which deceives Persons is, that they rather consider the Difficulties after the Choice, than before. It is very true, those who trust the Church, have no more to do afterward, but to believe and do as she directs; for they are to examine no farther, whether it be true or false, right or wrong, Vertue or Vice, which is commanded; the Church is to be obey'd. But those who follow the Scripture, must not only read, and weigh, and consider it well; but when Doubts arise, must make fresh Applications to their Rule, and use the best Means for understanding it, by Prayer, Meditation, and the Assistance of Spiritual Guides. And this is far more agreeable to the Design of the Christian Religion, as it was taught by Christ and his Apostles.

But the Difficulties of the Choice are now to be consider'd; and let us consider what those are about the Church, and then compare them with those about the Scripture.

If I choose a Church for my Infallible Guide in the Way to Heaven, to which the Promises of Christ do belong, then there are these Difficulties, both which I think impossible for my mind to get over.

(1.) I must exclude all other Churches in the Christian World from any share in these Promises. And either I must condemn them without hearing them, or examining the Grounds of their Exclusion, or I must be satisfied with the Reason of it; which I cannot be, till I am certain that Church hath justly shut out all other Churches, and challenged the Promises to her self alone.

(2.) I must be satisfied that Christ did intend one standing Visible Church to be my Director in the Way to Heaven. And for this purpose, I must examine all the places of Scripture produced to that end, and be judg of the clearness and evidence of them, *i. e.* I must conquer the Difficulties about the Scripture; as to Canon, Translation, and Sense, before I can be satisfied that I am to make choice of a Church.

(3.) There is yet a harder Point to get over; Suppose a Church must be chosen: why the Church of *Rome* rather than any other? What

What is there in the Promises of Christ, which direct me to chuse that Church and no other? Suppose I were born in *Greece*, and there I was told, I must chuse a Church for my Guide to Heaven. If it must be so, I will chuse our own *Greek Church*; *No, it must be the Church of Rome*. What Reason or Colour is there for it? Is it said so in Scripture? *No, not expressly*. But what Consequence from Scripture will make me do it? *There are Promises made to the Church*. What then? Were not our Churches planted by the Apostles? Have not we had a constant Succession of Bishops in them? Have we not four Patriarchs in our Communion, and you but one? For what imaginable Reason then should you exclude our Churches from any share in the Promises of Christ?

But now as to the *Scripture*, we are to consider;

1. That no more is necessary as to particular Persons, than knowing the things necessary to their Salvation; which are easy to be known, and are clearly revealed in Scripture, if *S. Chrysostom* and *S. Augustine* may be believed.

2. That what Difficulties are objected about the Scripture, must be all of them resolved by him that believes the Church, (as is already observed) but the Difficulties about the Church's Infalibility, do not concern him that relies on Scripture.

3. That the general Consent of the Christian Church, is of far greater Advantage for the satisfaction of a Man's Mind, than the Authority of any one Church, as about the Integrity of the Copies, and the Canon of Scripture.

4. As to Translations, the Unlearned in all Churches must trust to those that are Learned for the particular examination of them; but in general, a private Person may be satisfied by these Considerations.

(1.) That Men will not go about to deceive others in a Matter wherein so many are concerned; and in which it is so easy to discover any wilful Fraud.

(2.) That since the Divisions of Christendom, there are Parties still at watch to discover the Faults committed by each other in a Work of so publick a Nature.

(3.) That where a Translation hath been review'd with great care, after several Attempts, there is still greater Security as to the goodness of it. And this is the Case of the present Translation of our Church, which was with wonderful care review'd

and

and compared with the Original Languages, by the particular Direction of K. James I. and therefore deserves to be esteemed above such a Translation, which was never made out of the Original (as to the Old Testament) nor ever review'd and corrected by it. Which is the Case of the *Vulgar Latin*, and of such Translations which are made from it.

I had said, that the Scripture may be a Rule without the Church, but the Church cannot without the Scriptures.

The Replier, like a fair Adversary, mentions that which looks like an Objection, *viz. That there was a Church before the Scriptures* *Repl. p. 37.* *were written; and some Ages were passed before the Canon of Scripture was made and owned by the Church.*

To which I Answer; That when I said the Church cannot be a Rule without the Scripture, it was upon the supposition, that the Canon of Scripture had been long since owned by the Church, and that the Church derives its Infallibility from the Promises contained in the Scripture.

But the Defender goes another way to work; for, saith he, *The Scriptures, I say, may be a Rule without the Church; that is,* *Def. p. 72.* *without Faithful; for a Congregation of them is a Church. What! in the Sense now before us, as it is taken for a Guide! Is every Congregation of the Faithful a Church in this Sense? Then, well-fare the Independents. And this, me-thinks, makes Infallibility sink very low.*

I do not say, *There could be no Church before Scripture; nor that they had then no Rule of Faith; nor that the Church depends on writing; these are but mean Objections; but I still say, That where a Church challenges her Authority by the Scripture, it can signify nothing without it. Which is so plain, that I need not multiply words about it.*

As to his *Church-Security*, we have considered it enough already; but it would make one mistrust a *Security* which is so often offered.

I said, that suppose Infallibility be found in Scripture, there is yet a harder Point to get over, *viz. how the Promises relating to the Church in general, came to be appropriated to the Church of Rome.*

From hence he infers, *That I have at last found the Promises of* *Pag. 73.* *Infalibility to the Church there. Is not this a rare Consequence?*

Suppose I should say, I know a Book of Controversy in the
World,

World, that hath very little of true Reasoning in it ; but if it were to be found there, it doth not reach to the Point in hand. Doth this imply that I affirmed in the latter part, what I denied before ? Is this finding out true Reasoning in the latter Period, *which was not to be found in the former* ? There may be true Reasoning, when it is not to the purpose. So there might be Infallibility, and yet the Church of *Rome* not concerned in it. Suppose the Church of *Jerusalem*, as the *Mother Church*, might be Infallible by the Promises of Scripture ; what would this be to the Church of *Rome* ? But I never said, or thought, that there were any Promises of Infallibility made to any Church in Scripture : Promises of Divine Assistance and Indefectibility, I grant, are made to the Church in general : but these are quite of another Nature from Promises of Infallibility, in delivering Matters of Faith in all Ages. Yet if this were granted, the Church of *Rome*, as it takes in all of her Communion, hath no more reason to challenge it to her self, than *Europe* hath to be called *the Face of the whole Earth*.

Pag. 74.

As to his *Sandy Foundation*, I tell him in short, He that builds his Faith on the Word of God, builds on a Rock ; and all other things will be found but *Sandy Foundations*.

(4.) The next thing laid to our Charge is, *That we draw our Arguments from Implications, and far-fetch'd Interpretations, at the same time that we deny plain and positive words.*

In Answer to this ; (1.) It was shew'd, that in many of the Points in Difference, we have express words of Scripture for us. As, against the Worship of Images, and giving Divine Worship to any but God : and for giving the Eucharist in both kinds, and praying in a Language we understand.

Pag. 75.

The Defender would have me produce the very Words, to shew that the Scripture saith No, to what their Church saith I, or contrariwise.

He talked much before, that we give the same Answer the *old Hereticks* did ; and now I think he hath matched them. Shew us, say they, in Terms, the direct contrary to our Propositions ; where the Son was said to be Consubstantial to the Father ; or the Holy Ghost was a Divine Person ; or the Blessed Virgin the Mother of God ; or that there are two Natures in Christ after the Union. Will Reason and Consequences signify nothing, when founded on the Word of God ?

But

But I need not this answer, for I affirm that the words of the first and second Commandment, of the Institution of the Sacrament, *Drink ye all of this*; of *S. Paul 14.* of the first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, against Publick Service in an unknown Tongue, are so plain and evident, that there is no Command of Scripture but may be avoided and turned another way as well as these. And herein we go not upon our own Fancies, but we have the concurrent Sense of the Christian Church in the best and most Primitive Ages, in every one of the Points here mentioned.

And whether we are right as to the sense of the second Commandment; and as to Divine Worship in general, as to Christ's Institution amounting to a Command, as to *St. Paul's Discourse*: Which the Replier insists upon, next to the Scripture it self, and the Force contained therein; we appeal to the Primitive Church, as the most indifferent Arbitrator between us. Pag. 38, 39.

(2.) I answered; That where words seem plain and positive, they may have a Metaphorical or Figurative Sense; as when God hath *Eyes and Ears*, &c. *given him*; and the *Rock was Christ*. And so in the Words, *This is my Body*; it was a Sacramental Expression, as the other was; and the other words are figurative, when the *Cup* is said to be *the New Testament in his Blood*: and *St. Paul*, notwithstanding those words, called it *Bread* after Consecration.

Here the *Defender* will not bite, the Light being too clear for him; but descants upon denying plain words, and so runs clear off from the Point, which seemed to be chiefly meant by the Paper. Def. p. 76.

But the Replier is a generous Adversary, and attacks what stands before him. He endeavours to shew a Difference between *God's having Eyes and Ears*, &c. and those words, *This is my Body*, as to the receding from the literal Sense; because, saith he, there is an implication of impossibility in the one, but not in the other. But withal he grants, that if by *This* be meant the *Bread*, it would have implied an equal impossibility. R41. p. 39.

I am very glad to see this Point brought to so fair an Issue: For, if I do not prove by the general Consent of the Fathers, both of the *Greek* and *Latin Churches*, that by *This* the *Bread* is meant, I dare promise to become his *Preselyte*.

A Vindication of the Answer

(5.) The last Thing objected is, *That our Church subsists only on the Pleasure of the Civil Magistrate, who may turn the Church which way he pleases.*

To this it was answered ;

(1.) That the Rule of our Religion is unalterable, being the Word of God ; tho the Exercise of it be under the Regulation of the Laws of the Land.

(2.) That altho we attribute the Supreme Jurisdiction to the King, yet we do not question but there are inviolable Rights of the Church which ought to be preserved against the Fancies of some, and the Usurpations of others.

Repl. p. 41.

The Replier Answers, *That our Religion is built on private Interpretations of Scripture established by Law ; and therefore if the Law be mutable, the Religion is mutable.*

Def. p. 78.

The Defender desires I would make it appear, *that the Holy Scripture is such a Foundation, as makes the Protestant Church unalterable ; for the Letter of Scripture is common to all who bear the Name of Christians. And all Alterations of Religion are made upon pretence of Scripture.*

To give a clear and distinct Answer, I shall lay down these Propositions.

(1.) That altho Humane Laws be alterable, yet the Divine Law is unchangeable, and continues its Force on the Consciences of Men ; so that no Humane Law can make that lawful which God hath forbidden, nor that unlawful which he hath commanded. Whatever Change therefore may happen as to the Laws of Men, the Law of God is still the same, and its Obligation cannot be taken off by any Laws of Men. As suppose God hath forbidden the Worship of Images, or of Saints, or of any Creature, upon Supposition that it is not a Creature ; no Law in the World can make this lawful ; because God's Authority is Superior and Antecedent to Man's, and therefore cannot be superseded by an Act of Men. And this is one of the Fundamentals of the Christian Religion, without which it could never have been practised, when the Laws of the Empire were against it. So, neither can Humane Laws make that true which is against the Word of God, nor that false which is agreeable to it. They can never make *Transubstantiation* a true Doctrine, if it were not so before ; nor a *Purgatory* necessary to be believed, unless it be proved from Scripture to be so. So that the Foundation of our Religion,

Religion, being the Word of God, and the Obligation of that on the Consciences of Men, it must remain the same, tho Humane Laws be mutable. Howbeit, I do not deny the Magistrates Power in making Laws for regulating the Publick Exercise of Religion. But as we have cause to thank God for the establishment of the best Church in the Christian World by them among us ; so we are unwilling to put *such Cases* as the Defender doth, when we enjoy our Religion as established by Law : And it would be interpreted to be a mistrust of his Majesty's Gracious Promise to protect it. Pag. 80.

(2.) Although the Letter of Scripture be liable to Misinterpretations and Abuses, yet the true and genuine Sense of it may be understood ; and then there is a great difference between false and mistaken Notions, and the proper Sense of Scripture. This is very strange Reasoning, if Men will infer that there can be no certainty as to the Sense of Scripture, because so many have misinterpreted it. Is it any Argument that the Constitution of our Government is not firm ; or that Loyal Subjects cannot be certain of their Duty, because Men of ill Principles have run away with false Notions of a Fundamental Contract, and Coordinate Power ? Is there no Certainty in Law, because Judges have been of different Opinions, and determined the same Cause several ways ? Is there no Principle of Certainty in the World, because Men have been imposed upon, both by their Senses and Reason ? If notwithstanding this, we must allow that we may judg truly of some Things, (or else we must all turn Scepticks) then we desire no more than to observe the same Rules and Caution in judging the Sense of Scripture, which we do as to our judgment of other Matters. In them we take notice of the Causes of Errors, the Circumstances of Things, the Difference of Objects, the Nature of the *Medium*, and accordingly pass our Judgment. And in Things too small for our view, or too remote, we make use of Glasses to help us ; but all this while Men do not reason so weakly in these Matters. Do they say that some have been deceived by their Glasses and *Telescopes* ; therefore there is no certainty in any of them, and they must all be laid aside ; and whatever they talk of Spots in the Sun, and the unequal Surface of the Moon, they are all Fancies and *Chimera's* of giddy Brains, and no Men of sense can believe them ? If Mankind do not argue at this rate in other things, how come they to be so fatally unreasonable

A Vindication of the Answer

about the Scripture? *The Letter of Scripture*, say they, *is used for this Fancy, and the other Mistake, and a third pleads it for down-right Heresy: Every one thinks he hath the Letter of Scripture for him; and upon that he grounds his Faith.* And what then? The natural Consequence is, that every one would fain have Scripture of his side. Doth it really follow from hence that no Body hath it? Or that there can be no certainty who hath it, and who hath it not? *But every one thinks he hath it.* And what follows? *Some or others must be deceived.* I grant it; *But who shall tell who is deceived, and who not?* I pray let me ask one Question; Are you willing to be deceived, or not? *Who is willing to be deceived?* Every one that will not take the pains to be undeceived, or to prevent being deceived. *What pains do you mean?* Such honest Industry and Diligence which every one ought to take, who pretends he searches for Truth in order to his Salvation. And I dare affirm, such shall never want Means to attain certainty as to the Sense of Scripture in what concerns their Salvation.

But suppose the Question be about *Churches*, how can the Church of *England* assure Men that is the true Sense of Scripture which is delivered by it?

I Answer;

(3.) The Church of *England* hath offered all reasonable Satisfaction to Mankind, that it doth follow the true Sense of Scripture.

And that by these ways;

1. By not locking up the Scripture from the view of the People, but leaving it free and open for all Persons to judg concerning the Doctrines here taught. Which argues a great assurance, that our Church is not afraid of any Opposition to be found to the Word of God in the Articles of our Religion. And the contrary is vehemently to be suspected, where Reading the Scripture is forbidden the People, as it is in the Church of *Rome*, if the Popes Authority signify any thing; for *Clement the 8th*, did revoke the Power of granting Licenses, which was allowed by *Pius the 4th*. And I do not see how any Confessor can justify his acting against the Pope's Authority.

2. By not pretending to deliver the Sense of Scripture on her own Authority. If she did require her Members to depend wholly upon her Sense, without examining themselves, that very thing would render her Authority suspicious with all Inquisitive

quisitive Men; who always mistrust where there is too much Caution.

3. By her constant appealing to the Primitive Church ever since the Reformation, as the best Voucher for her keeping to the true Sense of Scripture. And in truth, one of the greatest Controversies between our Church and the Church of *Rome*, is not about the bare Letter of Scripture, but the best Interpreter of it. Our Church still contending, that the first and purest Ages of the Church, next to the Apostles Times, did certainly best understand the Sense and Meaning of Scripture; and the Church of *Rome* pretending, that the giving the true Sense of Scripture, belongs to the present *Catholic Church*, which they would be thought to be, against the plainest Evidence of Scripture and Reason. As appears by the foregoing Discourses.

The Defender's Cavil against the *Prayer* at the end of the Answer, would have held as well against *Amen*, if it had been added to it. But he was to answer all, and therefore the very *Prayer* could not escape his Confutation, or at least his putting an ill construction upon it; which was far from the Intention of him that made it. Who thinks it a part of a *good Christian*, to be *always a Loyal Subject*.

As to the summing up the Evidence in his Conclusion, I shall not follow him in it, since I think the Cause so clear in the opening of it, that I shall leave it as it is, to the Reader's Judgment.

An ANSWER to the DEFENCE of the THIRD PAPER.

Def. p. 111.

Pag. 86.

87.

88.

Ib. 125.

Ibid.

Pag. 85.

I Have now done as to matter of Reason and Argument ; the third Paper chiefly relates to Matter of Fact : which, if I were mistaken in, even the brisk Defender of it, doth me that Right, to say, the Bishop of Winchester did mislead me. For the whole Body of my Answer, he saith, is in effect a Transcript from the Bishop's Preface ; that I purloin his Arguments, without altering sometime so much as the property of his Words. That I have quoted him five times only in the Margin, and ought to have quoted him in almost every leaf of my Pamphlet. In short, if the Master had not eaten, the Man (saving Reverence) could not have vomited. This is a Taste of the Decency and Cleanliness of his Stile ; especially in writing for Princes and great Ladies, who are not accustomed to such a sort of Courtship to others, in their Presence. But as course as the Complement is, it clears me from being the Author of any Mistakes, and lays the blame on the Bishop, who is not able to answer for himself. Yet, as if I had been the sole Contriver and Inventer of all, he bestows those civil and obliging Epithets upon me, of *disingenuous, foul-mouth'd, and shuffling* ; one of a *virulent Genius, of spiteful Diligence and Irreverence to the Royal Family ; of subtil Calumny, and sly Asperion* ; and he adds to these Ornaments of Speech, that I have a *Cloven Foot, and my Name is Legion* ; and that my Answer is an *infamous Libel, a scurrilous saucy Pamphlet*. Is this indeed the Spirit of a *New Convert* ? Is this the Meekness and Temper you intend to gain Profelites by, and to convert the Nation ? He tells us in the beginning, that *Truth has a Language peculiar to it self* ; I desire to be informed whether these be any of the Characters of it ? And how the Language of *Reproach and Evil-speaking* may be distinguished from it ? But Zeal in a new Convert is a terrible thing ; for it not only burns but rages, like the Eruptions of Mount *Aetna*, it fills the Air with noise and smoak ; and throws out such a Torrent of liquid Fire, that there is no standing before it. The Answerer alone was too mean a Sacrifice for such a *Hæctor* in Controversy.

troverfy. All that standeth in his way muſt fall at his Feet. He calls me *Legion*, that he may be ſure to have number enough to overcome. But he is a great Proſicient indeed, if he be ſuch an *Exorcist*, to caſt out a whole *Legion* already. But he hopes it may be done *without Faſting and Prayer*.

If the People continue ſtedfaſt to their Religion, they are the *Rabble*; and the only Friends I can perceive he allows us. *My good Friends the Rabble* in one place, and in another, *Our Author* Page 92.
knows he has all the common People of his ſide; What nothing of Honour, or Dignity, or Wit, or Senſe, or Learning left of our ſide? 125.
 Not ſo much as a *Poet*, unleſs it be *Robbin Wiſdom*. I pray, Sir, 126.
 when was it that all *our Friends* degenerated into the *Rabble*? Do you think that *Hereſy*, as you call it, doth *ipſo facto* degrade all Mankind, and turns all Orders of Men, even the Houſe of ~~the~~ *Lords* it ſelf, to a meer *Rabble*? *If all the common People be of our ſide*, we have no Reaſon to be troubled at it; but there is another thing of our ſide, which you like worſe, and that is *common Senſe*; which is more uſeful to the World than School-Divinity. But methinks he ſhould not be angry with the *common People*, when he takes ſuch pains to prove, *That the Kingdom of Heaven is not only* Pag. 95.
for the Wiſe and Learned; and that *our Saviour's Diſciples were but poor Fiſhermen*; and we read but of one of his *Apoſtles who was bred up at the feet of Gamaliel*; and that *poor People have Souls to ſave as precious in the ſight of God as the grim Logicians*. Would not any one take this for an Apology for the *common People*, rather than for the *Duchefs of York*? Whoſe Wit and Underſtanding put her far beyond the need of ſuch a mean Defence? Could ſhe be vindicated in no other manner than by putting her into the rank of the Perſons of the meaneſt Capacities? But this is another part of the *Decency* of this Defence. He had ſeveral pretty ſayings, as he thought, upon this Subject, and therefore out they come, without regarding the Reflection implied in them on a Perſon of her Capacity as well as Dignity. And ſo he goes on in his *Plea for the Ignorant*, i. e. *for the common People*, as I am reſolved to underſtand 93.
 it. *Muſt they be damned unleſs they can make a regular Approach to Heaven in Mood and Figure*? *Is there no entering there without a Syllogiſm? or ergoteering it with a Nego, Concedo, & Distinguo*? This may paſs for Wit and Eloquence among thoſe I think he pleads for. And ſo I am content to let it go for the ſake of my Friends, the *common People*. But this is ſomewhat an unuſual way of defend- Pag. 98.
 ing,

Pag. 87.

ing, to plead for those he professes to despise, and in such a manner, as to reproach the Person he undertakes to defend.

From the *Common People*, we come to *Church-Men*, to see how he uses them. And he hath soon found out a *Faction* among them, whom he charges with *juggling Designs*: but *Romantick Heroes* must be allowed to make Armies of a field of Thistles, and to encounter Wind-mills for Giants. He would fain be the Instrument to divide our Clergy, and to fill them with suspicions of one another. And to this end, he talks of Men of a *Latitudinarian Stamp*: For it goes a great way towards the making *Divisions*, to be able to fasten a Name of Distinction among Brethren: This being to create Jealousies of each other. But there is nothing should make them more careful to avoid such *Names* of Distinction, than to observe how ready their common Enemies are to make use of them, to create Animosities by them: Which hath made this worthy Gentleman to start this different Character of Church-men among us; as tho there were any who were not true to the Principles of the Church of *England* as by Law established: If he knows them, he is better acquainted with them than the Answerer is; for he professes to know none such. But who then are these Men of the *Latitudinarian Stamp*? To speak in his own Language, they are a sort of *Ergoteerers*, who are for a *Concedo rather than a Nego*. And now I hope they are well explained. Or, in other words of his, *They are*, saith he, *for drawing the Non-conformists to their Party*: i. e. they are for having no Non-conformists. And is this their Crime? But they would take the *Headship of the Church out of the King's Hands*. How is that possible? They would (by his own description) be glad to see Differences lessened, and all that agree in the same Doctrine, to be one entire Body. But this is that which their Enemies fear; and this Politician hath too much discovered: for then such a Party would be wanting, which might be plaid upon the Church of *England*, or be brought to joyn with others against it. But how this should touch the *King's Supremacy* I cannot imagine. As for his desiring *Loyal Subjects to consider* this matter; I hope they will, and the more for his desiring it; and assure themselves, that they have no cause to apprehend any *juggling Designs of their Brethren*; who, I hope, will always shew themselves to be *Loyal Subjects*, and dutiful Sons of the Church of *England*.

The next he falls upon, is, the Worthy Answerer of the Bishop Pag. 88.
of Condom's Exposition, and him he charges with picking up Stories
against him, and wrapping them up with little Circumstances. How ma-
ny Fields doth he range for Game, to find Matter to fill up an An-
swer, and make it look big enough to be considered? But that
Author hath so well acquitted himself in his Defence, as to all the
little Objections made against him, that I can do the Reader no
greater Kindness, than to refer him to it.

I must not say, the poor Bishop of Winchester is used unmercifully
by him; for he calls him that Prelate of rich Memory. As though, Pag. 97.
like some Popes, he had been considerable for nothing, but for
leaving a Rich Nephew. But, as he was a Person of known Loy-
alty, Piety, and Learning; so he was of great Charity, and a
publick Spirit, which he shewed both in his Life-time, and at his
Death. Could nothing be said of him then but that Prelate of rich
Memory? Or, had he a mind to tell us he was no Poet? Or,
that he was out of the Temptation of changing his Religion for
Bread?

The Bishop of Worcester is charged with down-right Prevarica-
tion, i. e. being in his Heart for the Church of Rome, but for mean P. 104, 105, &c.
Reasons continuing in the Communion of the Church of England.
Therefore, saith he, take him Topham. And now what can I do more 108, 109.
for the poor Bishop? The most he will allow him is, that he was a
peaceable old Gentleman, who only desired to possess his Conscience and
his Bishoprick in Peace without Offence to any Man, either of the Ca-
tholick Church, or that of England. Yet he hath so much kindness
left for the poor Bishop, that for his sake he goes about to defend,
that a Man may be a true Member of the Church of England, who
asserts both Churches to be so far Parts of the Catholick Church, that Pag. 109.
there is no Necessity of going from one Church to another to be saved.

This is a very surprising Argument from a new Convert. Why
might he not then have continued still in the Communion of this
Church, tho he might look on the Church of Rome as part of the
Catholick Church? The Reason I gave against it was, that every
true Member of this Church must own the Doctrine of it con-
tained in the Articles and Homilies; which charge the Church of
Rome with such Errors and unlawful Practices, as no Man who be-
lieves them to be such, can continue in the Communion of that
Church; and therefore he must believe a Necessity of the for-
saking of one Communion for the other; and that no true Mem-

A Vindication of the Answer

ber of this Church can, with a good Conscience, leave this Church and embrace the other.

Let us now see what a Talent he hath at *Ergoteering*. If this be true, saith he, then to be a Member of the Church of England, one must assert that either both Churches are not Parts of the Catholick, or that they are so Parts, that there is a necessity of going from one to another. He would be a strange Member of the Church of England, who should hold that both Churches are not Parts of the Catholick; for then he must deny that Parts are Parts; for every true Church is so far a Part of the Catholick Church. Therefore, I say, he must hold, tho it be in some respects a Part of the Catholick Church; yet it may have so many Errors and Corruptions mixed with it, as may make it necessary for Salvation to leave it. The second, he saith, is *Nonsense*. How Nonsense? He doth well to hope that Men may be saved that do not understand Controversy; nor approach Heaven in Mood and Figure. A necessity of a Change, saith he, consists not with their being Parts; for Parts constitute one Whole, and leave not one and another to go to or from. We are not speaking of the Parts leaving one another; but of a Person leaving one Part to go to another. Suppose a Pestilential Disease rage in one part of the City, and not in another; may it not be necessary to leave one Part and go to the other, tho they are both Parts of the same City, and do not remove from one to the other? But he saith, with great assurance, that necessity of Change makes it absolutely impossible for both Churches to be parts of the Catholick. Which plainly shews, he never understood the Terms of Communion with both Churches. For, no Church in the World can lay on Obligation upon a Man to be dishonest, i.e. to profess one thing, and to do another; which is Dissimulation and Hypocrisy. And no Church can oblige a Man to believe what is false, or to do what is unlawful; and rather than do either, he must forsake the Communion of that Church.

Thus I have given a sufficient taste of the Spirit and Reasoning of this Gentleman.

As to the main Design of the *Third Paper*, I declared that I considered it, as it was supposed to contain the *Reasons* and *Motives* of the *Conversion* of so great a Lady to the Church of Rome.

But this Gentleman hath now eased me of the necessity of further considering it on that account. For he declares, That none of those Motives or Reasons are to be found in the Paper of her Highness. Which he repeats several times. She writ this Paper, not as to the

Reasons

Reasons she had her self for changing, &c. As for the Reasons of Ibid. it, they were only betwixt God and her own Soul, and the Priest with whom she spoke at last.

And so my Work is at an end as to her Paper. For I never intended to ransack the *private Papers*, or *secret Narratives* of great Persons. And I do not in the least question the Relation now given, from so great Authority as that he mentions of the Passages concerning Her; and therefore I have nothing more to say as to what relates to the *Person of the Duchess*. Page 112.

But I shall take notice of what this Defender saith, which reflects on the Honour of the Church of *England*.

(1.) *The Pillars of the Church established by Law*, saith he, *are to be found but broken Staffs by their own Concessions*. What! is the Church of *England* *Felo de se*? But how, I pray? For after all their undertaking to heal a wounded Conscience, they leave their *Proselytes* finally to the *Scripture*; as our *Physicians*, when they have emptied the *Pockets* of their *Patients*, without curing them, send them at last to *Tunbridg Waters*, or the *Air* of *Montpellier*. As tho the *Scripture* were looked on by us as a meer Help at a dead Lift, when we have nothing to say. One would think he had never read the *Articles* of the Church of *England*; for there he might have seen, that the *Scripture* is made the Rule and Ground of our Faith. And, I pray, whither should any Persons be directed under Trouble of Mind, but to the *Word of God*? Can any thing else give real Satisfaction? Must they go to an *Infallible Church*? But whence should they know it to be *Infallible*, but from the *Scriptures*? So that on all hands, Persons must go to the *Scriptures* if they will have Satisfaction. But this Gentleman talks like a meer Novice as to Matters of Faith, as tho believing were a new thing to him; and he did not yet know, that true Faith must be grounded on *Divine Revelation*, which the *Pillars of our Church* have always asserted to be contained only in the *Scripture*; and therefore whither can they send Persons but to the *Scripture*? But it seems he is got no farther than the *Collier's Faith*; he believes as the Church believes, and the Church believes as he believes; and by this he hopes to be too hard for a *Legion of Devils*.

(2.) He saith, *We are Reformed from the Vertues of good Living*, i. e. *from the Devotions, Mortifications, Austerities, Humility and Charity, which are practised in Catholick Countries, by the Example and Precept of that lean mortified Apostle St. Martin Luther*. Page 98.

A Vindication of the Answer

He knows we pretend not to *Canonize Saints*; and he may know, that a very great Man in the Church of Rome, once said, *That the new Saints they Canonized, would make one question the old Ones.* We neither make a Saint nor an Apostle of *Martin Luther*; and we know of no Authority he ever had in this Church. Our Church was reformed by it self, and neither by *Luther* nor *Calvin*, whom he had mentioned as well as the other, but for his lean and mortified Aspect. But after all, *Luther* was as lean and mortified an Apostle as *Bishop Bonner*; but a Man of far greater worth, and fit for the Work he undertook, being of an undaunted Spirit. What a strange sort of Calumny is this, to upbraid our Church, as if it followed the *Example and Precept* of *Martin Luther*? He knows, how very easy it is for us to retort such things with mighty advantage; when for more than an Age together, that Church was governed by such dissolute and profane *Heads* of the Church, that it is a shame to mention them; and all this by the confession of their own Writers. But as to *Luther's* Person, if his Crimes were his *Corpulency*, what became of all the fat *Abbots* and *Monks*? But they were no *Apostles*, or *Reformers*. I easily grant it. But must God chuse Instruments, as some do Horses, by their *fatness* to run Races. As to *Luther's* Conversation, it is justified by those who best knew him, and are Persons of undoubted Reputation, I mean, *Erasmus*, *Melancthon*, and *Camerarius*. And as to Matters in dispute, if he acted according to his Principles, his Fault lay in his Opinions, and not in acting according to them.

But whether our Church follow *Luther*, or not, it is Objected, that we have reformed away the *Vertues of good Living*. God forbid. But I dare not think there is any Church in the World, where the Necessity of good Living is more earnestly pressed. But I confess we of the Church of *England*, do think the Examples and Precepts of Christ and his Apostles, are to be our Rules for the Vertues of good Living. And according to them, I doubt not, but there are as great Examples of *Devotion*, *Mortification*, *Humility* and *Charity*, as in any place whatsoever. But I am afraid this Gentleman's Acquaintance did not lie much that way; nor doth he seem to be a very competent Judge of the Ways of good living, if he did not know how to distinguish between outward Appearances and true Christian Vertues. And according to his way of judging, the Disciples of the *Pharisees* did very much outdoe those of our *Blessed Saviour*; as appears by a Book we esteem very much, called the *New Testament*: but if I mention it to him, I am afraid

afraid he should think I am like the Physicians, who send their Patients to Tunbridg-Wells, or the Air of Montpellier. Pag. 101.

(3.) That two of our Bishops, whereof one was Primate of all England, renounced and condemned two of the established Articles of our Church.

But what two Articles were these? It seems they wished we had kept Confession, which no doubt was commanded of God; and praying for the Dead, which was one of the ancient things of Christianity. But which of our 39 Articles did they renounce hereby? I think I have read and consider'd them, as much as this Gentleman, and I can find no such Articles against Confession, and praying for the Dead. Our Church, as appears by the Office of the Visitation of the Sick, doth not disallow of Confession in particular Cases, but the necessity of it in order to Forgiveness in all Cases. And if any Bishop asserted this, then he exceeded the Doctrine of our Church, but he renounced no Article of it. As to the other Point, we have an Article against the Romish Doctrine of Purgatory, Art. 22. but not a word concerning praying for the Dead, without respect to it. But he, out of his great skill in Controversy, believes, that Prayer for the Dead, and the Romish Doctrine of Purgatory, are the same. Whereas this relates to the deliverance of Souls out of Purgatory, by the Suffrages of the Living; which makes all the gainful Trade of Masses for the Dead, &c. but the other related to the Day of Judgment, as is known to all who are versed in the Writings of the Ancient Church. But this our Church wisely passes over; neither condemning it because so ancient, nor approving it because not grounded on Scripture, and therefore not necessary to be observed.

(4.) But his great spite is at the Reformation of this Church; which, he saith, was erected on the Foundation of Lust, Sacrilege, and Usurpation. And that no Paint is capable of making lovely the hideous Face of the pretended Reformation. Pag. 112.
Pag. 117.

These are severe Sayings, and might be requited with sharper, if such hard Words, and blustering Expressions, had any good effect on Mankind. But instead thereof, I shall gently wipe off the Dirt he hath thrown in the Face of our Church, that it may appear in its proper Colours.

And now this Gentleman sets himself to Ergoteering; and looks and talks like any grim Logician, Of the Causes which produced it, and the Effects which it produced. The Schism led the way to the Reformation, for breaking the Unity of Christ's Church, which was the Foundation Pag. 117.

A Vindication of the Answer

Foundation of it; but the immediate Cause of this, which produced the Separation of Hen. 8. from the Church of Rome, was the refusal of the Pope to grant him a Divorce from his first Wife, and to gratify his Desires in a Dispensation for a second Marriage.

Ergo, the first Cause of the Reformation, was the satisfying an inordinate and brutal Passion. But is he sure of this? If he be not, it is a horrible Calumny upon our Church, upon King Henry the 8th, and the whole Nation, as I shall presently shew. No; he confesses he cannot be sure of it: For, saith he, no Man can carry it so high as the Original Cause with any certainty. And at the same time he undertakes to demonstrate the immediate Cause to be Henry the 8s. inordinate and brutal Passion. And afterwards affirms as confidently as if he had demonstrated it, That our Reformation was erected on the Foundations of Lust, Sacrilege, and Usurpation. Yet, saith he, the King only knew whether it was Conscience or Love, or Love alone, which moved him to sue for a Divorce. Then by his Favour, the King only could know what was the immediate Cause of that which he calls the Schism. Well! but he offers at some Probabilities that Lust was the true Cause. Is Ergo- teering come to this already? But this we may say, if Conscience had any part in it, she had taken a long Nap of almost twenty Years together before she awakened. Doth he think that Conscience doth not take a longer Nap than this, in some Men, and yet they pretend to have it truly awaken'd at last? What thinks he of late Converts? Cannot they be true, because Conscience hath slept so long in them? Must we conclude in such Cases, That some inordinate Passion gives Conscience a jog at last? So that it cannot be denied, he saith, that an inordinate and brutal Passion, had a great share at least in the production of the Schism. How! cannot be denied! I say, from his own words it ought to be denied, for he confesses none could know but the King himself; he never pretends that the King confessed it; How then cannot it be denied? Yea, how dare any one affirm it? Especially when the King himself declared in a Solemn Assembly, in these words, saith Hall, (as near, saith he, as I could carry them away) speaking of the dissatisfaction of his Conscience, — For this only Cause, I protest before God, and in the Word of a Prince, I have asked Counsel of the greatest Clerks in Christendom; and for this Cause I have sent for this Legat, as a Man indifferent, only to know the Truth, and to settle my Conscience, and for none other Cause, as God can judge. And both then, and afterwards, he declared, that his Scruples began upon the French

French Ambassador's making a Question about the Legitimacy of the Marriage, when the Match was proposed between the Duke of Orleans and his Daughter; and he affirms, *That he moved it himself in Confession to the Bishop of Lincoln, and appeals to him concerning the Truth of it in open Court.* Sanders himself doth not deny that the French Ambassador (whom he calls the Bishop of Tarbe, afterwards Card. Grammont; others say it was Anthony Vefey, one of the Presidents of the Parliament of Paris) did start this Difficulty in the Debate about this Marriage of the King's Daughter; and he makes a set Speech for him, wherein he saith, *That the King's Marriage had an ill Report abroad.* But then he adds, *That this was done by the King's appointment, and that Card. Wolfsey put him upon it;* but he produces no manner of Proofs concerning it, but only, *that it was so believed by the People at that time, who curst the French Ambassador.* As tho the suspicions of the People were of greater Authority than the solemn Protestation of the King himself.

Sand. de
Schifin. Angl.
l. 1. p. 11.

But I think it may be demonstrated, as far as such things are capable of it, from Sanders his own Story, that the King's first Scruples, or the jogging of his Conscience, as our Author styles it, could not come from an inordinate Passion to Ann Bolleyn. For he makes Card. Wolfsey the chief Instrument in the Intrigue. Let us then see what Accounts he gives of his Motives to undertake it. He not only takes notice of the great Discontent he took at the Emperor Charles V. the Queen's Nephew; but how studious he was upon the first intimation of the King's Scruples, to recommend to him the Dutcheß of Alençon the King of France's Sister; and that when there were none present but the King, Wolfsey, and the Confessor. Afterwards Wolfsey was sent on a very splendid Ambassy into France, and had secret Instructions to carry on the Match with the King of France's Sister. But when he was at Calais, he received Orders from the King to manage other Matters as he was appointed, but not to say a word of that Match. At which, saith Sanders, he was in a mighty rage, because he carried on the Divorce for nothing more, than to oblige the most Christian King wholly to himself by this Marriage. How could this be, if from the beginning of his Scruples he knew the King designed to marry Ann Bolleyn? But Sanders thinks to come off with saying, *That Wolfsey knew of the King's Love, but he thought he designed her only for his Concubine.* But this is plainly to contradict himself; for before he said, *That Wolfsey knew from the beginning whom he intended to marry.* Besides, what

Pag. 9.

Pag. 10.

Pag. 15.

Pag. 10.

An Vindication of the Answer

what Reason could there be, if the King had only a design to corrupt her, that he should put himself and the World to so much trouble to sue out a Divorce? For the Divorce was the main Thing aimed at in all the Negotiations at Rome; other Applications had been more proper, if his Design was only upon having her for a Concubine. But she would not be corrupted. If this were the Reason, he must again contradict himself, for he makes her a lewd vicious Woman. And it doth not seem so probable, if she had been such a Person as he describes her, that she would have put the King to so much trouble, and such a tedious method of proceeding, by so many Forms of Law. But again, *Sanders* saith, when she returned from France, and was at Court, she found out what *Wolfey* designed. Which makes it evident, by *Sanders* his own words, that the Design of the Divorce was before the thoughts of *Ann Bolleyn*. And it seems very probable, that *Card. Wolfey* might carry on a Publick Design by it, to draw the King off from the Emperor, and to unite him with France. And the Pope at that time being highly displeased with the Emperor, he might think it no difficult thing to procure a Dispensation, the King of France's Interest being join'd with our King's. Some have written, That the Pope himself was in this Intrigue at first; but seeing no Proof of it, I dare not affirm it: It is sufficient for my purpose, that the first Design was laid quite another way. I confess afterwards, when *Wolfey* upon his return from France, saw how things were like to go, he struck in with the King's Humour, as appears by the Letters of *Ann Bolleyn* to him: But yet carried himself so coldly afterwards in the Matter of the Divorce, that it proved one occasion of his Fall. *Thuanus*, being an Historian of great Judgment, saw the inconsistencies of *Sanders* his Relations; and therefore concludes that *Wolfey* was surprized with the Business of *Ann Bolleyn*, after he went into France, having notice sent him by his Friends; and that *Wolfey* wholly aimed at the French Match. *Mexeray* saith, The Cardinal could not foresee the Love of *Ann Bolleyn*, but his Design was to be revenged on the Emperor; and he questions whether the King were smitten with her, till *Wolfey* was sent into France; when the King so unexpectedly forbad him to proceed in that Match, cum summo eras dolore, as *Sanders* confesses. From all this we see plainly, that since *Sanders* makes *Card. Wolfey* the great Contriver and Manager of this Business, the immediate Cause of the Schism could not be the Love of *Ann Bolleyn*.

Pag. 18.

Acworth. c.
Sander. l. 2.
• 14, 17.

Pag. 22.

But

But we have other kind of Proofs concerning this Matter, besides *Sanders* his Inconsistencies, and those shall be from some of the greatest and most active Men of that Time, and some remarkable Circumstances.

The first is a Person of unquestionable Integrity, and accounted a Martyr for his Conscience at that Time; I mean Sir *Thomas More* then *Lord Chancellor*; who after he had delivered to the House of Commons the Original Papers of the Universities in favour of the Divorce, he then said, *That all Men should clearly perceive that the King hath not attempted this Matter of Will and Pleasure, as Strangers say, but only for the Discharge of his Conscience, and the Security of the Succession to the Crown.* Which was a Reason alledged by the King himself; and seems to have been built on the Grounds which *Charles* the 5th assigned for breaking his Oath which he made to marry the *Lady Mary*, by the first Article of the Treaty at *Windsor*. *Lord Herbert* owns that the Emperor, to avoid the Force of this Treaty, had alledged something against the Marriage between the King and his Aunt: But another Author, who lived much nearer the Time, doth affirm, *That when the Match was debated in the Spanish Council, it was then said, That altho the Match between the King and his Brother's Relict were not yet disputed, yet if the King should die without Issue Male, rather than the Kingdom should pass to Foreigners, the English Nation would dispute the Validity of the Marriage.* And to confirm this, in Sir *Henry Spelman's* Manuscript-Register of the Proceedings of the Legatine Court about the Divorce, subscribed by the three Notaries there present, the Witnesses deposed, *That at the time of the Marriage, the People said commonly, that it was unfit one Brother should marry the other Brother's Wife.* And Arch-bishop *Warham* then upon Oath declared, *That he told K. Henry the 7th, that the Marriage seem'd to him neither Honourable, nor well-pleasing to God.* And he confesses, *the People then murmur'd at it, but that the murmuring was quieted by the Pope's Dispensation.* So that all the Satisfaction that was given about it, arose from the Pope's extraordinary dispensing Power with the Laws of God. Which was a thing vehemently opposed by many in the Church of *Rome*; and the University of *Bononia* it self afterwards declared, *That the Match was abominable, and that the Pope himself could not dispense with it;* and this they say was, after they had read *Card. Cajetan's Defence of the Marriage.* The like was done by the University of *Padua*; besides many others which I shall not mention, and are easily to be seen.

History of H. 8
p. 216.

Servi Fidelis
Responso, &c.

So that *the Succession to the Crown* by this Match, must depend upon an extravagant Power in the Pope, which the Roman Church it self never owned; and the wisest Statesmen thought by no means fit to depend upon.

The notice of this Debate in the Spanish Council being sent over to Card. *Wolsey*, seems to have been the *first Occasion* taken of starting the Question about the Lawfulness of the King's Marriage; which *Wolsey*, out of a private Grudg to the Emperor, as well as for other Reasons, was not wanting to carry on, till he saw which way it was like to end. And the Pope himself was willing enough to grant the *Bull* for the *Divorce*, till he made a secret Peace with the Emperor: and it is easy to see that the Pope went forwards and backwards in the whole Affair, merely as *politick Considerations* moved him. Which being fully known to so discerning a Prince as *Henry the 8th*, it gave him just occasion to question, whether that Authority were so Divine as was pretended, which in so great a Matter did not govern it self by any Rule of Conscience, but by Political Measures.

One remarkable Circumstance in this Matter ought not to be omitted, *viz.* That the King's Agent at Rome sent him word, *That the Pope's Advice was, that if the King's Conscience were satisfied, he should presently marry another Wife, and then prosecute the Suit; and that this was the only way for the King to attain his Desires.* But the King refused to do it. And when Card. *Wolsey* sent a Message to the King to the same purpose: the King replied, *If the Bull be naught, let it be so declared; and if it be good, it shall never be broken by any by-ways for me.* And when he objected the tediousness of the Suit, he answered, *Since he had Patience eighteen Years, he would stay yet four or five more, since the Opinion of all the Clerks of his Kingdom (besides two) were lately declared for him: Adding, That he had studied the Matter himself, and Writers of it; and that he found it was unlawful, DE JURE DIVINO, and undispensible.*

Thus we have found the King himself declaring in Publick and Private, his real dissatisfaction in Point of Conscience; and that it was no inordinate Affection to *Ann Bolleyn* which put him upon it: and the same attested by Sir *Tho. More*, and the Circumstances of Affairs. I now proceed to another Witness.

The next is Bishop *Bonner* himself, in his Preface to *Gardiner's* Book of *True Obedience*: For thus he begins; *Forasmuch as there be some, doubtless, now at this present, which think the Controversy be-*

twice.

tween the King's Royal Majesty, and the Bishop of Rome, consisteth in this Point, for that his Majesty hath taken the most excellent and most noble Lady Ann to his Wife; whereas in very deed, notwithstanding, the Matter is far otherwise, and nothing so. So that if Bishop Bonner may be believed, there was no such immediate Cause of the Schism, as the Love to Ann Bolleyn. And withal he adds, That this Book was published, that the World might understand what was the whole Voice and resolute Determination of the best and greatest learned Bishops, with all the Nobles and Commons of England; not only in the Cause of Matrimony, but also in defending the Gospel's Doctrine, i. e. against the Pope's usurped Authority over the Church. Again, he saith, That the King's Marriage was made, by the ripe Judgment, Authority, and Privilege of the most and principal Universities of the World; and then with the Consent of the whole Church of England. And that the false pretended Supremacy of the Bishop of Rome was most justly abrogated; and that if there were no other Cause but this Marriage, the Bishop of Rome would content himself, i. e. if he might enjoy his Power and Revenues still; which, he saith, were so insupportable, that there lay the true Cause of the Breach: For his Revenues here were near as great as the King's; and his Tyranny was cruel and bitter, which he had exercised here under the Title of the Catholick Church, and the Authority of the Apostles, Peter and Paul; when notwithstanding he was a very ravening Wolf, dressed in Sheeps clothing, calling himself the Servant of Servants. These are Bonner's words, as I have transcribed them, out of two several Translations, whereof one was published while he was Bishop of London.

Stephen Gardiner Bishop of Winchester, in his Book, not only affirms the King's former Marriage to be unlawful, and the second to be just and lawful; but that he had the Consent of the Nation, and the Judgment of his Church, as well as foreign Learned Men for it. And afterwards he strenuously argues against the Pope's Authority here, as a meer Usurpation.

And the whole Clergy not only then owned the King's Supremacy, (Fisher excepted) but in the Book published by Authority, called, *A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition of a Christian Man*, &c. The Pope's Authority was rejected as an Usurpation, and confuted by Scripture and Antiquity. K. James I. declares, That there was a General and Catholick Conclusion of the whole Church of England in this Case. And when some Persons suspected, that it all came from the King's Marriage, Bishop Bonner we see undertakes to assure the World it was no such thing.

*Apol. for the
Oath of Allegi-
ance.*

A Vindication of the Answer

The Separation was made then by a General Consent of the Nation, the King, and Church, and People, all concurring : and the Reasons inducing them to cast off the Popes Usurpation, were published to the World at that time. And those Reasons have no relation at all to the King's Marriage ; and if they are good, as they thought they were, and this Gentleman saith not a word to disprove them, then the Foundation of the Disunion between the Church of Rome and Us, was not laid in the King's inordinate Passion, but on just and sufficient Reasons.

Thus it appears, that this Gentleman hath by no means proved two parts of his Assertion, viz. *That our Reformation was erected on the Foundations of Lust and Usurpation.*

Pag. 118.

But our grim Logician proceeds from Immediate and Original, to Concomitant Causes ; which, he saith, were *Revenge, Ambition, and Covetousness.* But the Skill of Logicians used to lie in proving ; but this is not our Author's Talent, for not a word is produced to that purpose. If bold Sayings, and confident Declarations will do the Business, he is never unprovided ; but if you expect any Reason from him, he begs your Pardon ; he finds how ill the Character of a grim Logician suits with his Inclination. However, he takes a leap from Causes to Effects ; and here he tells us, the immediate Effects of this Schism, were *Sacrilege, and a bloody Persecution, of such as denied the King's Supremacy in Matters wholly Spiritual, which no Layman, no King of Israel ever exercised.*

Ibid.

What the Supremacy was, is best understood by the Book published by the King's Order, and drawn up by the Bishops of that Time. By which it appears, that the main thing insisted on was, rejecting the Pope's Authority ; and as to the positive Part, it lies in these things. 1. *In Defending and Protecting the Church.* 2. *In overseeing the Bishops and Priests in the execution of their Office.* 3. *In Reforming the Church to the old Limits and pristine Estate of that Power which was given to them by Christ, and used in the Primitive Church.* For it is out of doubt, saith that Book, that Christ's Faith was then most pure and firm, and the Scriptures of God were then best understood, and Vertue did then most abound and excel : And therefore it must needs follow, that the Customs and Ordinances then used and made, be more conform and agreeable unto the true Doctrine of Christ, and more conducing unto the edifying and benefit of the Church of Christ, than any Custom or Laws used or made by the Bishop of Rome, or any other addicted to that See and usurped Power since that time.

This.

This Book was published with the King's Declaration before it. And therefore we have reason to look on the *Supremacy* to be taken as it is there explained. And what is there now *so wholly Spiritual, that no Layman, or King of Israel, ever exercised in this Supremacy?* But this Writer never took the pains to search into these things, and therefore talks so at random about them.

As to the *Persecutions* that followed, it is well known that both sides blame K. Hen. 8. for his Severity; and therefore this cannot be laid to the Charge of his Separation. For the other Effect of *Sacrilege*, I do not see how this follows from the Reformation: For although some Uses might cease by the Doctrines of it, as Monks to pray the Dead out of *Purgatory*; yet there were others to have employed the Church Lands about, as some of them were in founding *New Bishopricks, &c.* And I have nothing to say in justification of any Abuses committed that way; only that the King and Parliament could not discern the difference between greater and lesser as to the Point of *Sacrilege*; and since the Pope had shewed them the way, by granting *Bulls for the dissolution of the lesser Monasteries*, they thought, since the Pope's Power was taken away, they might, with as little *Sacrilege*, dissolve the rest. I will shut up this with the words of Arch-bishop Laud; *But if there have been any wilful and gross Errors, not so much in Opinion as Fact, (Sacrilege too often pretending to reform Superstition) that's the Crime of the Reformers, not of the Reformation, and they are long since gone to God to answer it, to whom I leave them.* Conference, S. 24. p. 155.

The Method I proposed for Satisfaction of Conscience about the Reformation, was to consider, Whether there were not sufficient cause for it? Whether there were not sufficient Authority? And whether the Proceedings of our Reformation were not justifiable by the Rules of Scripture, and the Ancient Church? He tells me, *he may safely join issue with me upon all three Points, and conclude in the Negative.* But upon second thoughts, he finds he may much more safely let it alone: And very fairly would have me take it for granted, *That the Church of Rome cannot err in Matters of Faith; (for that he must mean by the Church there) and that our Church hath no Authority of Reforming her self; and that our Proceedings were not justifiable according to the right interpretation of Scriptures by the Fathers and Councils.* But if I will not allow his *Affirmations for Proofs*, for his part he will act the grim Logician no longer; and in truth, it becomes him so ill, that he doth well to give it over. When he will Pag. 112.

will undertake to prove, that the Church of Rome is the *One Catholick and Infalible Church of Christ*, and answer what I have produced in the former Discourses, I will ease him of any farther Trouble; for then I will grant that our Reformation cannot be justified. But till then, I shall think it no want of *Humility* to conclude the Victory to be on our side. And I would desire him not to end with such a bare-faced Assertion of a thing so well known to be false, viz. *That there is not one Original Treatise written by a Protestant, which hath handled distinctly, and by it self, that Christian Vertue of Humility.* Since within a few Years (besides what hath been printed formerly) such a Book hath been published in London. But he doth well to bring it off with, at least that I have seen or heard of; for such Books have not lain much in the way of his Enquiries. Suppose we had not such particular Books, we think the *Holy Scripture* gives the best Rules and Examples of *Humility* of any Book in the World; but I am afraid he should look on his Case as desperate if I send him to the *Scripture*, since he saith, *Our Divines do that, as Physicians do with their Patients whom they think incurable, send them at last to Tunbridg-Waters, or to the Air of Montpellier.*

F I N I S.

E R R A T A.

The Folio's, through mistake, are twice repeated, from Pag. 81, pag. 92, inclusive.

Pag. 7. line 26. for *Authority*, read *Antiquity*.

Pag. 22. l. 39. f. *Personæ*, r. *Parfopa*.

Pag. 23. l. 25. f. *when*, r. *whom*. l. 26. f. *his*, r. *as*. l. 32. f. *Western*, r. *Southern*.

Pag. 26. l. 5. f. *S. Cyprian*, r. *San Lyan*.

Pag. 68. l. 32. r. *Some of the Chingese*.

Pag. 78. l. 3. a whole line faulty, r. *pristinam & melioratam recipere marcaris sanitatem*.

Pag. 86. (2d.) l. 23. blot out *not*.

Pag. 93. l. 23. blot out *borb*.

Pag. 103. l. 14. f. *House of the Lord*, r. *House of Lords*.

Pag. 108. l. 20. f. *farness*, r. *finess*. l. 28 f. *dare not*, r. *do not*.

Pag. 112. l. 37. f. *eras*, r. *ejus*.

Pag. 116. l. 17. f. *Declarations*, r. *Declamations*.

Books lately printed for Richard Chiswell.

The History of the Reformation of the *Church of England*. By GILBERT BURNET, D. D. in two Volumes. Folio.

The Moderation of the *Church of England*, in her Reformation, in avoiding all undue Compliances with *Papery*, and other sorts of *Pharisaicism*, &c. By TIMOTHY PULLER, D. D. Octavo.

A Dissertation concerning the Government of the *Ancient Church*: more particularly of the Encroachments of the *Bishops of Rome* upon other *Sees*. By WILLIAM CAVE, D. D. Octavo.

An Answer to Mr. *Serjeant's* [Sure Footing in Christianity] concerning the Rule of Faith: With some other Discourses. By WILLIAM FALKNER, D. D. 4o.

A Vindication of the Ordinations of the *Church of England*; in Answer to a Paper written by one of the *Church of Rome*, to prove the Nullity of our Orders. By GILBERT BURNET, D. D. Octavo.

An Abridgment of the History of the Reformation of the *Church of England*. By GILB. BURNET, D. D. Octavo.

The APOLOGY of the *Church of England*; and an Epistle to one Signior Scipio, a *Venetian Gentleman*, concerning the Council of *Trent*. Written both in Latin, by the Right Reverend Father in God, JOHN JEWEL Lord Bishop of *Salisbury*: Made English by a Person of Quality. To which is added, The Life of the said Bishop: Collected and written by the same Hand. Octavo.

A LETTER writ by the last Assembly General of the *Clergy of France* to the *Protestants*, inviting them to return to their Communion. Together with the *Methods* proposed by them for their Conviction. Translated into English, and Examined, by GILB. BURNET, D. D. Octavo.

The Life of WILLIAM BEDEL, D. D. Bishop of *Kilmore* in *Ireland*. Together with *Certain Letters* which passed betwixt him and *James Waddsworth* (a late Pensioner of the Holy Inquisition of *Sevil*) in Matter of Religion, concerning the General Motives to the *Roman Obedience*. Octavo.

The Decree made at *ROME* the Second of *March*, 1679. condemning some Opinions of the *Jesuits*, and other *Casuits*. Quarto.

A Discourse concerning the Necessity of Reformation, with respect to the Errors and Corruptions of the *Church of Rome*. Quarto. First and Second Parts.

A Discourse concerning the Celebration of Divine Service in an Unknown Tongue. Quarto.

Books lately printed for Richard Chiswell.

A Papist not Misrepresented by Protestants. Being a Reply to the Reflections upon the Answer to [A Papist Misrepresented and Represented]. *Quarto.*

An Exposition of the Doctrine of the *Church of England*, in the several Articles proposed by the late BISHOP of *CONDOM*, [in his Exposition of the Doctrine of the *Catholic Church*]. *Quarto.*

An Answer to *THREE PAPERS* lately printed, concerning the Authority of the *Catholic Church* in Matters of Faith, and the Reformation of the *Church of England*. *Quarto.*

A *CATECHISM* explaining the Doctrine and Practices of the *Church of Rome*. With an Answer thereunto. By a *Protestant* of the *Church of England*. 8s.

A Papist Represented and not Misrepresented, being an Answer to the First, Second, Fifth and Sixth Sheets of the Second Part of the [Papist Misrepresented and Represented]; and for a further Vindication of the *CATECHISM*, truly representing the Doctrine and Practices of the *Church of Rome*. *Quarto.*

The *Lay-Christian's* Obligations to read the Holy Scriptures. *Quarto.*

The *Plain Man's* Reply to the *Catholic Missionaries*. 24s.

A Vindication of the Answer to *SOME LATE PAPERS* concerning the Unity and Authority of the *Catholic Church*, and the Reformation of the *Church of England*. *Quarto.*

A Treatise written by an *AUTHOR* of the Communion of the *CHURCH of ROME*, touching *TRANSUBSTANTIATION*. Wherein is made appear, that according to the Principles of *THAT CHURCH*, This Doctrine cannot be an Article of Faith. *Quarto.*

63357